4.8.11

Library of the Theological Seminary

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by A.G. Cameron, Ph.D.

BT 260 .M455
Meikle, James, Rev. of Beith.
The nature of the mediatorial dispensation

THE

MEDIATORIAL DISPENSATION.

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
* APR 8 1911 *
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE

NATURE

OF THE

MEDIATORIAL DISPENSATION.

BY
REV. JAMES MEIKLE,
BEITH,
Author of 'The Edenic Dispensation.'

'There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.'—1 TIM. ii. 5.

'This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.'—1 TIM. i. 15.

LONDON:
WARD & CO., PATERNOSTER ROW.
EDINBURGH: JOHNSTONE AND HUNTER.
GLASGOW: DAVID ROBERTSON.
MDCCCLIII.

TO

THE ELDERS AND MEMBERS

OF

THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,

MITCHELL STREET, BEITH,

This Volume

IS AFFECTIONATELY INSCRIBED,

BY

THEIR PASTOR.

PREFACE.

It was my original intention to give, in one volume, a consecutive view both of the nature and administration of the Mediatorial Economy; but I had not proceeded far in the work of composition, until I perceived that a volume such as was contemplated would be required for each of these topics. I therefore abandoned that intention, and resolved to consider only the first part of the subject at present, leaving the discussion of the second for a separate publication, should this afterward be deemed expedient.

In giving a consecutive view of the nature of the Mediatorial Dispensation, I have endeavoured to state, in logical order and with brevity, the doctrines of christianity which come under consideration, and to prove the truth of these by an appeal to the holy

scriptures—the all-perfect standard of faith and practice.

Objections, no doubt, will be brought against the manner in which the Work is executed, and some of its statements will be condemned, by one party or another; nevertheless, I hope that it will aid many, and especially young inquirers, in their efforts to obtain a scriptural knowledge of the nature of the Mediatorial Dispensation, and that it will tend to fortify their minds against those errors on the subject, which have been embraced and disseminated by some theologians, both in this and in other lands.

Praying that the 'Spirit of truth' may bless my endeavours for these ends, in so far as the doctrines stated and defended in the following pages are consistent with his revealed will, I humbly commend the treatise to the attentive consideration and kind indulgence of all who peruse it.

J. M.

Beith, *October*, 1853.

CONTENTS.

Page

INTRODUCTION, - - - - - - - - - 1

CHAP. I.—THE DIVINE PURPOSE OF MERCY IN REGARD TO MAN.

SECT. I. God has actually purposed to save sinners of the human race through the mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ, 9

SECT. II. The Purpose of God to save sinners by the Mediator, alike the Purpose of the Three Persons of the Godhead, 10

SECT. III. One Purpose, - - - - - - - - 13

SECT. IV. An Eternal Purpose, - - - - - - - 15

SECT. V. Presupposes the Divine Foreknowledge of the Fall of Adam, and consequent Sinfulness and Misery of the Human Race, - - - - - - - - 17

SECT. VI. Originates in the Sovereignty of the Divine Nature, - 33

SECT. VII. Distinguished by its Equity, - - - - - - 36

CHAP. II.—THE ENDS TO BE ACCOMPLISHED BY THE PURPOSE OF MERCY.

SECT. I. The Ends of the Purpose of Mercy in relation to God, 38

SECT. II. In relation to the evil and holy angels, - - - 40

SECT. III. In relation to man, - - - - - - - 41

These ends of two classes: the one, general and common to the race; the other, special and peculiar to those who are saved.

1. The general end of the Purpose of Mercy, - - 41

2. The special end of that Purpose, - - - - 58

CHAP. III.—THE MEANS BY WHICH THE PURPOSE OF MERCY IS ACCOMPLISHED.

Page

SECT. I. The Purpose of Mercy Accomplished by means of the formation or assumption of new relations between the Three Persons of the Godhead, and between these and fallen man, - - - - - - - - 73

1. It is the will of the Three Persons of the Godhead, that the Son, in the Economy of Redemption, should act as the Father's Servant, - - - - - 78

2. In a Representative Character;— - - - - 82

As the Representative of a peculiar people, - - 95

SECT. II. The Purpose of Mercy Accomplished by Means of the Covenant transactions between the Father, as sustaining the majesty and rights of Deity, and the Son as constituted the Father's Servant and the Representative of believers, - - - - - - 109

The nature of these transactions in the Covenant of Grace explained and vindicated, - - - - 113

SECT. III. The Purpose of Mercy Accomplished by Means of the work that Christ performed, in fulfilling the condition of the Covenant of Grace, during the state of his humiliation on earth, - - - - - - 121

I. *The Son of God fitted for fulfilling that condition by the constitution of his Mediatorial character,* - - 132

II. *The work that he performed on earth,* - - - 138

1. Gave perfect obedience to the Precepts of the Divine Law, - - - - - - - - - 138

2. Suffered death, the penalty of its transgression, - 139

III. *The Perfection of the work of Christ,* - - - 148

1. Proved from its nature, - - - - - 148

2. Proved from the terms the Holy Ghost employs in describing it, - - - - - - 148

These of two classes, - - - - - 149

Page

SECT. III.—(*Continued.*)—*First*, Those terms which have a reference to THE NATURE of the work of Christ, namely—

Obedience unto death, - - - - - 149
An Offering and a Sacrifice, - - - - 150
A Propitiatory Sacrifice, - - - - - 153
A Ransom or Price, - - - - - 156
Righteousness, - - - - - - 161
The work the Father gave him to do, - - - 162

Secondly, Those terms which have a reference to *the* EFFECTS it produced, namely—

Propitiation and Pardon, - - - - - 164
Atonement or Reconciliation, - - - - 174
Redemption, - - - - - - - 186
Regeneration and Sanctification, - - - 189
Eternal Life, - - - - - - - 196

3. Proved from the testimony of every order of intelligent beings in the universe, - - - - 197

IV. *The value of the work of Christ*, - - - - 202

Not dependent on Divine appointment, but on its nature, - - - - - - - - - 203

1. Consists in its absolute perfection, - - - 204
2. Founded on his Divinity, - - - - 205

V. *The efficacy of the work of Christ*, - - - - 212

It secured the accomplishment of all the ends of the purpose of mercy, - - - - - - - 212

1. The death of Christ efficacious in securing the accomplishment of the general end of the Purpose of Mercy,—the establishment of the Mediatorial form of Government, or law of faith as the rule by which the conduct of every man ought to be regulated, - - - - - - - - 214

Proof of this doctrine, - - - - - 215
Explanatory Observations, - - - - 220

2. The death of Christ efficacious in securing the accomplishment of the special end of the Purpose

Page

SECT. III.—(*Continued.*)—of Mercy;—the actual salvation of a definite number of the human race from sin and misery, and their Redemption unto God, - - - - - 257

Proof of this Doctrine, - - - - - 258

Explanatory Observations, - - - - 299

VI. *The extent of the Death of Christ*, - - - - 336

Statement of the question in reference to the extent of Christ's death, - - - - - - 336

1. The theory of exact equivalent stated and refuted, 338

2. The theory of infinite sufficiency, but definite intention, or limited destination, examined and set aside, - - - - - - - - 338

3. The theory of indefinite or universal atonement, with gracious sovereignty in its effectual application, examined and refuted, - - - - 340

4. The scriptural theory stated and vindicated, - 359

VII. *The necessity of the Death of Christ*, - - - 361

The necessity of the Death of Christ, both to the universal proclamation of mercy, and to the bestowal of pardon on those who believe, proved—

1. From the total inability either of men or angels to fulfil the condition of the Covenant of Grace, - 362

2. From the reality of Christ's death as the ordained means of human salvation, - - - - 365

3. From the nature of Moral Government, - - 366

4. From the character and perfections of God,—the Moral Governor of the universe, - - - 371

SECT. IV. The Purpose of Mercy accomplished by means of the work which the Mediator performs in the administration of the Covenant of Grace, - - - - 380

CONCLUSION, - - - - - - - - - - 382

APPENDIX, - - - - - - - - - - 391

THE

MEDIATORIAL DISPENSATION.

The Mediatorial Dispensation is that system of benevolence and mercy which God has established in Christ, for the purpose of manifesting his glory in the salvation of sinful and perishing men.

This economy stands intimately connected with the Edenic Dispensation. (See Appendix.) It presupposes the fall of man, and the consequent universal sinfulness and misery of the human race. If Adam had maintained his integrity during the period of his probation, and not broken the law of works which God gave him when he put him into the garden of Eden, and appointed him to act as the representative of his posterity, it is certain, from the terms of that constitution, that both he and his descendants would have been confirmed in a state of perfect holiness and happiness, and, consequently, that the appointment of a mediator would have been altogether unnecessary to the welfare of mankind. But, alas! Adam, the representative of his race, did eat the forbidden fruit,

and by that act of disobedience brought himself and all his posterity into a state of depravity—of subjection to the dominion of Satan—and of liability to death, the curse of the law. The Mediatorial Dispensation also presupposes that all men are in a state of condemnation, and under the wrath of God, on account of their personal transgressions. If they were not born in a state of depravity, of subjection to Satan, and under the curse of the law—if they did not personally break the law of God in thought, word, and deed—and if they did not consequently deserve the wrath of God both in this life and in that which is to come; it is evident that they could not have needed a Saviour to redeem them from these evils, and to transform them into the image of God; and that a dispensation of mercy would never have been established in our world. The sin of Adam in violating the law of works, and the consequent sinfulness and misery of the human race, are therefore to be viewed as the *occasions* of the mediatorial interposition of divine mercy in behalf of fallen man. Had sin not entered the world, and death by sin, the appointment of the Son of God to act as Mediator between God and men, would have been altogether unnecessary.

The Mediatorial Dispensation is of a *remedial* character. It is wisely adapted, both in its constitution and administration, to the character and condition of men as sinners against God, and as in a state of condemnation on account of the disobedience of Adam,

and of their personal transgressions. Its establishment in the world has placed all mankind under a form of government different from that which existed in Eden. And, in consequence of this act of divine goodness, all of the race who come to God through the Mediator shall now obtain deliverance from sin and its penal consequences, and be ultimately exalted to the enjoyment of perfect holiness and happiness in the kingdom of glory.

The Mediatorial Dispensation was established by God in the garden of Eden immediately after he had, in consequence of Adam's sin, judicially abrogated the law of works. The curse which God pronounced on the serpent because of his sin in tempting Eve to eat the forbidden fruit, contains the first intimation that was given to man of the purpose of mercy, and of the nature and glorious results of the work which the Mediator was to perform for its accomplishment. 'I will,' said God to the serpent, 'put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.' It is evident from the terms of this curse, that, while it denounced the wrath of God against Satan, it at the same time proclaimed his benignity and mercy to fallen and perishing man, and revealed the mystery of his will in regard to the existence, nature, and ends of the Mediatorial Dispensation. The time of this revelation is signalised as that epoch in the history of our world from which the ad-

ministration of the mediatorial economy is to be computed.

The administration of the Mediatorial Dispensation is founded on the work which the Son of God performed in the human nature at the fulness of time. Its administration during the Patriarchal and Levitical ages was founded on the death of Christ as an event which, though future, was, nevertheless, absolutely certain; and its administration in New Testament times is founded on the same event as actually accomplished on the cross, and now past. Everything in the administration of the covenant of grace, previous to the coming of Christ, had a prospective reference to his death, and everything since his advent has a retrospective reference to that event; and it is this reference which imparts to the revelations and doctrines, to the laws and ordinances, and to the promises and threatenings of the mediatorial economy, in every form of its administration, all their significance, interest, and efficiency, as means of human salvation.

The Mediatorial Dispensation has higher claims on the attention and love of mankind than any other of the great and marvellous works of Jehovah. It is the chief of the ways of God; 'for he has magnified his word above all his name.' It presents to the eye of the intelligent universe more extensive and interesting manifestations of the nature, and perfections, and glory of the Divine Being, than those which are given in the works of creation and common providence.

It reveals to sinful man the means by which he may obtain deliverance from the ruins of the fall, and be restored to the favour and image of God, which he has lost by transgression. It is the most valuable privilege that God has conferred on man in the present world. 'This is life eternal,' says Christ, 'that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.' And must not the enjoyment of it, therefore, place every sinner under the most solemn responsibility to seek this eternal life through the knowledge of Jesus Christ the Lord? The gospel, an apostle assures us, will be to men either the savour of death unto death, or the savour of life unto life, according as they abuse or improve it. Now if these things are so, is it not our duty, and ought it not to be the chief object of our pursuits in life, to acquire a knowledge of the mediatorial economy—

> 'to stand
> On Truth's serenest hill-top, far above
> The mists of error,'

and to contemplate the glory of the Lord as manifested in the work of redemption, that in the contemplation of it, we may be 'changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord,' and that we may be thus fitted to glorify God in our body and in our spirit, which are God's?

The Mediatorial Dispensation may, in general, be contemplated in two aspects, *First*, in reference to its

NATURE; and, *Secondly*, in reference to its ADMINISTRATION. It is our design in this treatise to contemplate it in the first of these aspects.

In considering the nature of the Mediatorial Dispensation, we shall direct the attention of the reader—

I. To *the purpose of mercy* which God has purposed in himself in reference to sinners of the human family.

II. To *the ends* contemplated in this purpose; and,

III. To *the means* by which these ends are to be accomplished.

CHAPTER I.

THE DIVINE PURPOSE OF MERCY IN REGARD TO MAN.

THE Mediatorial Dispensation originated, as the apostle Paul declares, in the purpose which God in eternity, 'according to his good pleasure, hath purposed in himself;' and we cannot, therefore, acquire a scriptural knowledge of it unless we attend to the nature and character of that divine purpose of which its establishment amongst men is the acknowledged result.

On this subject, then, we observe, in general, that the purposes or decrees of God are simply the determinations of his will, in which he chooses out of the possible things which his almighty power could effect, those things which, in his infinite wisdom, he judges fittest and best for him to do, and resolves to do them. Like all intelligent and voluntary beings, of whom he is the archetype, he acts from design, purposing ends, and that invariably in connection with means for their accomplishment. The Almighty, in all his purposes, and in all the works which he performs in executing them, has always an ultimate end in view, and that end, according to his nature, as infinitely good and

wise, is always the best, and accomplished by the fittest means. On these principles, therefore, we regard it as an incontrovertible maxim on the subject of the divine decrees, *that means and ends are necessarily and inseparably connected in the purposes of God.* Would not the denial of this be a denial of the infinite intelligence and wisdom of the Supreme Being, and therefore atheistical?

It should also be remarked that the Almighty, as a designing agent, always wills or purposes the things which he is to do before he does them; for example, he purposed to create the universe before he called it into existence by the word of his power. He purposed to govern the universe which he made by such physical, instinctive, and moral laws as were adapted to the nature of the material, the animal, and the intelligent beings of which it is composed, before he actually governed it according to these laws. And he purposed the plan of salvation before he executed it. Now, if God thus purposes or determines by an act of choice the things which he does, before he does them, we are bound to conclude, from the works he performs in every department of his administration, that these are works which he eternally purposed to execute. Besides, if no created intelligence or combination of intelligences can counteract the might of omnipotence, or baffle the wisdom of the Eternal; if God's counsel shall stand, and he will do all his pleasure, we are also bound to conclude, that he will certainly execute all

his purposes. 'The Lord is in one mind, and who can turn him? and what his soul desireth, even that he doeth.' (Job xxiii. 13.) On these principles, therefore, we regard it as another incontrovertible maxim on the subject of the divine decrees and administration, *that God purposes all that he does, and does all that he purposes.*

Having made these remarks respecting the purposes of God in general, we shall now direct the attention of the reader particularly to the purpose of his mercy in regard to man; and here let it be observed—

SECT. I.—*That God has actually purposed to save sinners of the human race, through the Mediation of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

The truth of this proposition is evident from the fact that God, in times past, has actually saved many sinners of the human family, and already received them into heaven. Now, if God purposes all that he does, and if he has already saved many sinners, it follows, from what he has done for them, that he must have eternally purposed to save them. The truth of this doctrine is also clearly attested by the word of God. 'God hath made known to us,' says the apostle Paul, 'the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself. . . . In whom,' (that is in Christ) 'we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the

counsel of his own will.' (Eph. i. 9–11.) 'According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.' (Eph. iii. 11.) And again he says, 'God hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.' (2 Tim. i. 9.) These texts distinctly prove that God in eternity purposed to save many sinners of the human family, and that he executes this purpose through the mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ.

SECT. II.—*The purpose of God to save sinners by the Mediator is alike the purpose of the Three Persons in the Godhead.*

The scriptures plainly teach us the unity of the Divine Being. 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord.' (Deut. vi. 4.) 'There is none other God but one.' (1 Cor. viii. 4.) The truth of this fundamental doctrine of religion is also attested by that unity of design and agency which invariably characterises all the works of God, whether of creation, or providence, or redemption.

The scriptures, at the same time, teach us with equal clearness that there are three persons, or subsistences, in the one divine nature, namely, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. (See Matt. xxviii. 19; 2 Cor. xiii. 14; 1 John v. 7; Rev. i. 4, 5.) When we affirm that there are three persons in the Godhead, we do

not mean that these three are one in the same sense in which they are said to be three; but that they are numerically one with respect to nature, possessing in common the same essence and perfections, and numerically three with respect to personality. Neither do we mean that these three persons are three Gods, for there is only one God; but we use the language to express that distinction in the Godhead, which is manifested by the distinct agency and acts which are respectively ascribed to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in all the works of Deity, especially in the work of man's redemption. The nature of this distinction in the Godhead, or of the mode of the divine existence which the word person is meant to designate, we presume not to explain. It is a subject far beyond the ken of mortals. 'Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?' 'The fact that a distinction exists in the Godhead, which the word person is meant to designate,' says Moses Stuart, 'is what we aver. The definition of that distinction is what I shall by no means attempt. By what shall I, or can I define it? What simile drawn from created objects, which are necessarily derived and dependent, can illustrate the mode of existence in that Being who is underived, independent, unchangeable, infinite, eternal? I confess myself unable to advance a single step here in explaining what the designation is. I receive the fact that it exists, simply because I believe that *the scrip-*

tures reveal the fact. And if the scriptures do reveal the fact that there are three persons in the Godhead—that there is a distinction which affords ground for the appellation of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which lays the foundation for the application of the personal pronouns, *I, thou, he,* which renders it proper to speak *of sending and being sent,* of Christ *being with God, being in his bosom,* and other things of the like nature, and yet that the divine nature belongs to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: then it is like every other fact revealed, to be received simply on the credit of divine revelation.' (Moses Stuart's answer to Channing. Letter iii.)

It is further evident from scripture testimony that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as thus possessing distinct personality in the same divine essence, co-operate in accomplishing the work of our redemption, according to the order of their subsistence, and the distinct personality which belongs to each of them in that essence. The Father sent the Son into the world,—the Son came and acted in the world as sent by the Father,—and the Holy Spirit bestows salvation as proceeding from the Father and Son. Now, if everything that the Most High does is the result of a previous purpose, and if the three persons of the Godhead perform distinct personal acts in the work of human salvation, it follows that the purpose of mercy must be equally the purpose of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Accordingly we find the

scriptures teach us that *God is love*, and that this infinite perfection of the divine nature, as belonging equally to the Father, Son, and Spirit, is the common cause to which the distinct works which each of these persons performs for the salvation of sinners, are to be ascribed. The Father, they tell us, 'loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.' (1 John iv. 10.) 'The Son hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour.' (Eph. v. 2.) The Holy Ghost also hath loved us; for we find that the love of the Spirit is spoken of as a motive to duty: 'I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, *and for the love of the Spirit*, that ye strive together in your prayers for me.' (Rom. xv. 30.) On these principles we conclude that the purpose of God to save sinners is not merely the purpose of the Father, but also the purpose of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. It is the common purpose of the triune Jehovah.

SECT. III.—*The purpose of God to save sinners through the Mediation of Christ is one purpose.*

Though the distinct agency of the three persons of the Godhead is manifested in the execution of the purpose of mercy, and though there was a corresponding distinct agency in its formation, yet this is only one purpose, because these persons are not three Gods but only one God, and because they all co-ope-

rate in its accomplishment. Hence the scriptures invariably represent and speak of it, not as the purposes, but as the *one* '*purpose* of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.' (Eph. i. 11.) This purpose originated in one cause, the sovereign love of God, or the good pleasure of his will—has one grand end, the manifestation of the divine glory—and includes all the means by which that end is to be accomplished: 'For of him, and through him, and to him are all things, to whom be glory for ever. Amen.' There are indeed a variety of important ends to be accomplished by this purpose, as we shall see afterwards, but they are all subordinated to the glory of God, and comprehended in it. The mind of the omniscient Jehovah is not like the mind of finite beings whose knowledge is defective and progressive, and who form their purposes in succession according to circumstances. In his mind there can be no succession of thought. God perceives all things intuitively and determines by one act of the will everything which he is afterwards to execute. 'Known unto God are all his works from the beginning.'

Though, however, the purpose of God is one, yet divines commonly speak of the purposes of God as if they were as numerous as the various works which he performs in creation, providence, and redemption. Our finite minds cannot perceive the great and marvellous works of God by a single glance; we can only contemplate them in detail; and knowing that every-

thing that he does is the effect of an antecedent purpose, we think and speak of the counsel of his will as if it were composed of many purposes. Nor is this wrong. The Most High himself speaks to us in language adapted to our limited capacities, and calls us to contemplate his counsel as if it were composed of as many purposes as the ends which he accomplishes. 'Hear ye the counsel of the Lord, that he hath taken against Babylon; and *his purposes*, that he hath purposed against the land of the Chaldeans.' (Jer. l. 45, and xlix. 20.)

SECT. IV.—*The purpose of God to save sinners through Christ is eternal.*

The purposes of God in reference to the creation of the universe, of material, sentient, and rational beings, and in reference to the government of all these beings by laws suitable to their nature respectively, are eternal, like God himself. While the truth of this statement is generally admitted, some theologians maintain that those purposes of God, which stand connected with the free agency of man, were not made in eternity, but in time. According to this theory of temporal decrees, the fall of Adam was an absolutely contingent event, and consequently the purpose of mercy could not be formed by God until that event, unforeseen by him, had actually taken place. This theory is plainly subversive of the knowledge of God as infinite, and of the character of his administra-

tion in providence as immutable, for it represents him as ignorant of events depending on human volition till these are effectuated, and as necessitated to form new resolutions according to the character of these events. Moreover, it stands in direct opposition to the explicit statements of the holy scriptures, which affirm that the purpose of God to save sinners by Christ Jesus is an eternal purpose: 'God,' says Paul, 'hath saved us according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus, *before the world began.*' (2 Tim. i. 9.) And he further assures us that all of our race who shall be eventually saved 'were chosen in Christ *before the foundation of the world.*' (Eph. i. 4.) On these principles, therefore, we conclude, that the purpose of God to save sinners is an eternal purpose, and no after-thought of the Deity consequent on the disobedience of Adam.

Since, then, the divine purposes are all eternal, it must be presumptuous to determine the order of these purposes in regard to time. It is plain that none of them can precede or succeed others if all are co-eternal. Though, however, the purposes of God are all co-eternal, yet we may be allowed to arrange and speak of them according to the order of nature; or in that order which appears to us most agreeable to the nature of things, and the revelations of the sacred oracles.

SECT. V.—*The eternal purpose of God to save sinners by Jesus Christ, presupposes the divine foreknowledge of the fall of Adam, and consequent sinfulness and misery of the human race.*

If the purpose of God to save sinners through the mediation of Christ was formed, as we have seen, in eternity, it is evident that the fall of man, and the consequent sinfulness and misery of the human race, must have been eternally foreknown by God. There is a manifest distinction between the decrees or purposes, and the foreknowledge of God, and this distinction should be carefully attended to in all our inquiries regarding the entrance and continuance of moral evil in the world.

1. *The disobedience of Adam was not the object of a divine purpose.*

To say that God decreed that event, would be in reality the same thing as to affirm that he effectuated it; for every thing that God does in time, he in eternity purposed to do. Now would not such a view of the matter represent the holy Lord God as the efficient cause of man's transgression, and plainly run counter to these words in the inspired narrative of that event: 'The man said, I did eat?' The things which God actually did for man, both in his primeval state and under the Edenic dispensation, distinctly indicate and define what those things were which in eternity he purposed to do for him. God created Adam. He made him a rational, voluntary, holy, and account-

able being, and endowed him with a power of agency distinct from the divine and angelic,—he put him into the garden of Eden,—he constituted him there the representative of his race, gave him the law of works, placed him in a state of probation, and suspended his own welfare and that of all his posterity on his obedience to this law;—he there also put forth all the influence that was consistent with a state of probation, the influence of motives,—to induce him to obey that law;—and he left him to act, under this dispensation, entirely according to the freedom of his own will. It is evident that these things, which God actually did, were the things which in eternity he purposed to do for man in Paradise. He did not purpose that Adam should either keep or break the law of works; for these being human acts, must in either case be attributed to the purpose of man himself, and not to that of the Almighty. The purpose of God did not relate to the conduct of Adam in any other sense than that he should be left during the period of his probation, and, as made under the law of Paradise, to act according to the freedom of his will. The deed of man, either in the event of obedience or disobedience, must therefore be exclusively the result of the purpose of his own mind, as a free and accountable agent. The decrees of God are neither inconsistent with, nor do any violence to, the free agency of his rational creatures.

Neither is the disobedience of Adam, properly

speaking, the object of a divine decree *to permit it*. It is very often said by theologians, that God has decreed to permit sin. Now, if to permit, as Dr Johnson says, is 'to allow without command' a thing to be done, it is evident, from the infinite purity of the divine nature, that God can no more decree to allow sin, than he can decree to do evil. Besides, the doctrine of decree always involves the idea of causation; and, therefore, to say that there was a divine purpose to permit or allow sin, is either to utter a contradictory proposition, or to bring a charge against the Almighty as if he were the author of moral evil. Though, however, it is incorrect to speak of a divine purpose to permit sin, yet, since sin exists under the government of God, we are warranted to say he has permitted it—meaning thereby, not that he has purposed to allow it, but that he has not purposed to bestow such divine influences on moral agents placed in a state of probation, and left to the freedom of their will, as would have prevented them from committing it.

2. *The disobedience of Adam, though not an object of the divine purpose, was, however, an object of the divine foreknowledge.*

The divine understanding is infinite. God necessarily knows all things. His omniscient eye sees, by one intuitive glance, what men call the past, the present, and the future. We might here show that God knows all things which it is possible for himself

to do, and also all things which he has purposed actually to do; but as the point under discussion refers to human volitions and actions, it is sufficient for our purpose to observe, that God both knows all things which it is possible for man to do, and also all things which he will actually do. The truth of this statement is clearly established by the word of God: 'I am God,' says he, 'and there is none like me; declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done.' (Isa. xlvi. 9, 10.)

It is evident from the scriptures that God foresees all the holy volitions and actions of good men: 'In thy seed,' said he to Abraham, 'shall all the nations of the earth be blessed;' and again he says, 'All kings shall fall down before him, all nations shall serve him; in him shall the Gentiles trust.' If God, however, did not foreknow the holy volitions and actions of all amongst the Gentiles who were to trust on Christ for salvation, and to serve him, how could he have predicted these events as events which should certainly come to pass? Would not the denial of this doctrine destroy the character of these and similar revelations as truthful predictions, and degrade them to the level of mere conjectures? It is also evident from the sacred writings, that God foreknows all the sinful volitions and actions of wicked men. He foreknew and foretold that Pharaoh would not let the Israelites go into the wilderness to sacrifice unto the Lord their God, a con-

siderable time before the commandment to this effect was addressed to him: 'I am sure,' said God to Moses, 'that the king of Egypt will not let you go, no, not by a mighty hand.' (Ex. iii. 19.) God foreknew and foretold by the prophet Elisha that Hazael would do evil unto the children of Israel, set fire to their strongholds, and slay their young men with the sword, ere he was king of Syria. (2 Kings viii. 12, compared with 2 Kings x. 32, 33, and other passages.) If, then, it is thus proven, from these and many similar predictions in the bible, that God foreknows all the volitions and actions of men, whether these are good or evil, we are warranted to conclude that no event depending on human volitions can be unforeseen by God, and consequently that the fall of Adam was a subject of the divine foreknowledge. The knowledge of God could not be infinite unless he foresaw that event as certainly future. To say that the knowledge of God is infinite, and that he does not infallibly foresee all events, is to maintain contradictory propositions.

The truth of this conclusion is further confirmed by the doctrine we have already established, namely, that the purpose of mercy is an eternal purpose. This purpose, it is plain, could not be an eternal purpose unless the sin of Adam, in its reality and in its results, which are confessedly the occasions of that purpose, had been eternally foreknown by God. The eternity of the purpose of mercy is most conclusive evidence that the fall of Adam, and the consequent sinfulness

and misery of the human race, were eternally objects of the divine foreknowledge.

3. *The disobedience of Adam being thus an object of the divine foreknowledge, must have had a cause or ground of certainty.*

The sin of Adam was not a contingent event. A contingent event or act is one that happens by accident and chance, or without a cause. There cannot, however, be any such event under the government of the all-wise God. All events or acts are effects, and effects cannot exist without a cause. We indeed often speak of future events as contingent, not on the ground that they take place without a cause, but because, from the limited capacities of our minds, we do not know beforehand either the causes that are in operation to effectuate them or what shall actually come to pass. But no event can be contingent in relation to God. Admit the contingency of events, and would not this represent the Supreme Being as governing the worlds of matter and mind by no fixed laws, and as necessitated to change his purposes to suit the contingencies that occurred under his administration? Would not this withdraw man from the government of God and moral law, and place him under the dominion of chance? And would not this destroy the very foundation of morality? for a man obviously could neither be praiseworthy, nor blameworthy, who did good or evil by accident and chance. Besides, a contingent event, from

its very nature, as regulated by no fixed rule, and depending on no cause, must necessarily be an uncertain event; and for this reason, as it appears to us, it could not be an object of foreknowledge even to the Deity himself. But the sin of Adam, as has been already shown, was eternally foreknown by God, therefore that deed could not be a contingent or uncertain event. It did not take place without a cause. Now what was that cause?

That cause or ground of certainty cannot be the decretive will of God. The purposes of God no doubt constitute a ground of certainty in reference to the actions which he performs, that the things purposed shall actually come to pass. He assuredly shall do every thing in time which in eternity he purposed to do. The certainty of events ascribable to his purposes must, however, necessarily be restricted to such events as are righteous and good, and either done by himself or by other moral agents through his influence; for he neither can purpose to do, nor do, nor cause to be done, any thing that is evil. The act of Adam in eating the forbidden fruit being a sinful act, and not the object of a divine purpose, as has been already shown, must therefore have a different cause or ground of certainty than the decretive will of God.

It is an error to suppose that there is no other ground of certainty regarding the actions of moral agents than the appointment or decree of God.

Deeds that are evil must have a cause or ground of certainty as truly as those that are good. This cause cannot be in God. It is evident, from the infinite purity of his nature, that he cannot be the cause of moral evil, either directly or indirectly. This cause, therefore, must exist exclusively in the sinner himself. Man is the author of his own sins. The truth of these two doctrines, that God is not the cause of moral evil, and that the cause of human sin exists exclusively in man himself, is established by reason and revelation (see James i. 13–15), and must be held sacred in all our inquiries regarding the existence and origin of evil.

Assuming it then as undeniably true, that Adam is the author of his own sin, and that the cause of his disobedience is in himself, what is that cause? This cause is not to be found in the nature of man as a fallible creature; for the doctrine of the fallibility of moral agents merely proves that they *may* sin, not that they *shall* sin. Some of the angels kept their first estate. Neither is this cause to be found in the nature of the faculties of the human mind; for God has endowed man with all the powers of his animal and rational nature, simply as principles of action, not of evil action. Man, according to his nature, seeks truth and happiness, not falsehood and misery. Nor is this cause to be found in the condition of man in Paradise, as a state of probation; for the motives to obedience which God presented to the mind of Adam

under that form of moral government, were infinitely stronger than any motives which could be presented to his mind to induce him to violate the law by which his conduct was to be regulated. But this cause is to be found in the volitions or purposes of the mind of Adam. The acts of man, as truly as the acts of God, are the effects of the purposes of his own mind. It seems reasonable to conclude, that as the purposes of God constitute a ground of certainty in reference to the works which he performs, so the purposes of man must also constitute a ground of certainty in reference to his conduct as placed in a state of probation under the Edenic law. It was certain, from the very nature of Adam, as an intelligent and voluntary agent, that he would act under the Edenic law either in one way or in another. It was possible for him either to keep or to break that law, but impossible that he could both keep and break it. One of these two things was certain. Both events could not in the nature of things take place. The event depended entirely on the purpose which Adam would form in the exercise of those powers of intelligence and volition with which he was endowed, and for which he was responsible. Adam formed an evil purpose, and this evil purpose determined the event, and is the cause to which his disobedience is to be ascribed. Since, then, the sin of Adam is the effect of this cause, it is evidently absurd to represent it as a contingent or uncaused event, and to ascribe it to

any other cause than the perverse volition of his own mind.

Should we push our researches farther, and inquire concerning the formation of this evil purpose, we shall find also that it was not of a contingent character, but originated in himself as a designing agent. Though the evil purpose which Adam formed to eat the forbidden fruit stands connected with those motives which were presented to his mind by Satan, through the instrumentality of Eve, yet it was not caused by these objectively considered, but by these viewed subjectively or by the view which his understanding took of them, and by the desires which he entertained in his heart after apprehended good. Man, as a being distinct from all other agents, has the power of recognising and feeling the obligations of law, of attending to motives, of weighing them, of forming purposes, and of acting from design; and in the exercise of this power as a responsible agent, he is left to act according to the freedom of his will. This power we regard as an ultimate principle of human nature, and as the cause to which all man's purposes and actions are to be traced. The exercise of this power also belongs to man, as an agent distinct from God and all other beings. In the formation of a purpose, or in the choice of the will, man, indeed, may be, and is often influenced by other agents; nevertheless, it is still his prerogative, as a being endowed with the power of personal agency, to purpose and to act

for himself. Now, if these things are so, it follows that the evil purpose and act of Adam in Paradise were not God's, but exclusively his own. God simply sustained the faculties of his mind, and commanded him to exercise these according to the Edenic law, and for his own welfare and that of his posterity, and left him to act according to the freedom of his own will. His evil purpose was obviously the act of his own mind, and formed in opposition to the divine authority and influence, and caused by the views he took, as an intelligent being, of those motives to action which were addressed to him by Satan, and by the desires he cherished after apprehended good. Adam's purpose to eat the forbidden fruit was not, therefore, a contingent purpose; but the effect of the exercise of that power of agency, which he possessed as a being distinct from God, who commanded him to keep the law of Eden, and from Satan, who tempted him through Eve to violate it;—and hence the culpability of that evil purpose must be attributed exclusively to himself.

4. *The divine foreknowledge of the sin of Adam, and of all the evil actions of men, is founded, not on the purposes of God, but on the infinite nature of his understanding, as knowing all things.*

The purposes of God, as has been already shown, are a ground of certainty that the things purposed shall be accomplished; but it appears unscriptural to regard these, according to the opinion of many theolo-

gians, as the grounds of his foreknowledge; or, in other words, that events are foreseen only because they are decreed. If this were so, then it evidently follows that the sin of Adam, and the sins of all men, are either not foreseen by God, or that they are the objects of a divine purpose. In opposition, therefore, to the theory which involves such inadmissible consequences, we affirm that *the purposes of God are founded on the infinite nature of his understanding.*

It seems reasonable to believe that God, as an omniscient being, in eternity perceived all things which it is possible for himself to do, ere he selected out of these possibilities the things which are wisest and best, and purposed to do them. And, moreover, in eternity he perceived all those things which it was possible for his rational creatures to do, and likewise all the things which they would actually do, as under law to him, ere he formed those purposes which determined the character of his subsequent administration towards them. For example, on his foreknowledge of the fall of some of the angels, he purposed to deal with them simply according to the principles of equity, or to punish them for their sins. Foreseeing, also, the fall of man, he purposed to deal with the human race both according to the principles of equity and of sovereign mercy.

Should any object to these statements, and suppose that this view of the subject makes the divine purposes dependent on the actions of creatures, we

deny that the conclusion is warranted by the premises. From these it can only be legitimately inferred that certain purposes of God are founded, not on the actions of evil angels and of men, but on God's knowledge or foreknowledge of their sins. It cannot be denied that the purposes of God have a relation to moral agents and their actions. Had none of the angels sinned, there could have existed no reason for a purpose to punish them. Had Adam not sinned, there could have been no occasion for the purpose of mercy to save sinners by Jesus Christ. But it is one thing to say that the purposes of God have a relation to moral agents and their actions, and a different thing to affirm that they are founded on the conduct of these agents. Nor can it be denied that the purpose of God to punish sinners, because they violate his laws, is founded in equity, even in the infinite purity and justice of his nature. The Holy and Just One cannot be otherwise than angry with the wicked. Nor can it be denied that the purpose of God to save sinners through Jesus Christ originates in the sovereignty of his nature, as having a right to act according to the good pleasure of his goodness. God, notwithstanding the fall of Adam, and his eternal foreknowledge of it, might have acted merely on the principles of equity towards him and his race, and left all to reap the bitter fruits of transgression. Nor can it be denied that the purposes of God, in relation to these moral agents, which are thus either founded in equity

or in sovereignty, or in both of these divine perfections, are at the same time all founded on his knowledge as infinite. He purposes to do the things which he does, because these appear to the eye of his infinite understanding to be the wisest and the best for illustrating the glorious perfections of his nature, for maintaining the principles and efficiency of his government, and for advancing the eternal happiness of every loyal subject throughout his immense empire. If these things are true, then it follows that the knowledge or foreknowledge of God—for these, as acts of the divine mind, are not different, but one and the same thing—is not the effect of purpose, but a necessary antecedent of its existence.

When, however, we speak of the divine mind as first perceiving and then purposing, or of the omniscience of God as the foundation of his purposes, it must be distinctly understood that this language relates simply to the analogical order of the operation of the human mind, according to which we form our conceptions of the acts of the divine mind; for, in reality, there can be no such thing as succession of purpose to knowledge in the mind of God, 'with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.' All the acts of his mind are co-eternal. Hence the apostle does not say, after 'God had foreknown the saints he predestinated them,' but, 'Whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate.'

5. *The divine foreknowledge of the disobedience of*

Adam had no causal influence whatsoever, either directly or indirectly, in producing that event.

There is, as has been already observed, a manifest distinction between the knowledge of God and his purposes or decrees. The purposes of God are the volitions of his own mind, and refer to the events which he himself brings to pass. The foreknowledge of God relates to the volitions and actions of men, or of other moral agents which he has created, and is simply the prescience of what these shall do in the exercise of that distinct agency with which he has endowed them, as the subjects of his moral government. The purposes of God have a causal influence in effecting the objects which he purposes to accomplish, either in nature or providence. The foreknowledge of God has no causal influence in determining any moral agent to the commission of evil. It is an axiomatic truth, that the holy Jehovah can neither cause nor occasion the sinful volitions and actions of man, or of any rational being whatsoever. It would be impious to speak of sin as the object of a divine purpose; for, if God always does what he purposes to do, would not this, in effect, attribute it to his agency? And how absurd would it be to suppose that God had decreed an event which he neither could nor would effectuate? When, therefore, we affirm that the sin of Adam was an object of the divine foreknowledge, we merely represent that sin as foreseen by God, without attributing it, either directly or indirectly, to his agency.

The divine knowledge of which we are speaking, is, in the language of theologians, 'the knowledge of simple intelligence' (*scientia simplicis intelligentiæ*). It does not cause things to be. It did not cause Adam to sin, and had no influence whatever on his conduct. Our knowledge or foreknowledge of the evil deeds of a fellow-sinner can have no influence in causing him to perform them. If a man were to perceive a fellow-mortal doing a wicked action, would any one ever think of ascribing it to his influence, or charging him either with the performance or guilt of it, because he had accidentally seen it done? If a master were to perceive his servant disobeying his lawful command, could any man believe that the act of disobedience on the part of the servant was either caused or occasioned by his master, because he had witnessed the performance of it? Would not all, on the contrary, ascribe it to the agency and waywardness of the servant himself? In like manner, does not that man act most unreasonably and in direct opposition to the principles on which he judges of the conduct of his fellow-men, who would attribute Adam's sin, or the crimes of mankind, in any way to God, because he simply sees them when being done, or foresees them before they are committed? On these principles it appears evident that God's foreknowledge of sinful actions generally, and consequently of the disobedience of Adam particularly, could have no causal influence, directly or indirectly, in producing these results.

SECT. VI.—*The purpose of God to save sinners by Jesus Christ originates in the sovereignty of the divine nature.*

The purpose of salvation does not originate in the justice of God. The justice of God, viewed in relation to moral agents, is that perfection of his nature in the exercise of which he claims from each of them that perfect obedience which is due to himself, and gives to all of them their due. Perfect obedience is due to God from every rational being, and when this is not given, his justice binds him to vindicate this absolute right by the punishment of transgressors. Death, therefore, according to the terms of the law of works, was due in equity to Adam and his race, in consequence of his sin in eating the forbidden fruit; and if God had acted towards them simply according to the principles of equity, he would have inflicted on them for ever that penal evil. Justice requires that sinners should be punished—not that they should be pardoned and saved. It is evident, from the very nature of justice, that the purpose of mercy could not originate in this perfection of Deity. On the contrary, it can only be ascribed to the sovereign goodness of God, as its originating cause.

By the sovereignty of God, we mean that independent and absolute right, which necessarily belongs to him, to bestow on the subjects of his government, or to withhold from them, according to the good pleasure of his will, every blessing which is not due to them on

the principles of equity. It is that perfection of the divine nature which disposes God to do good to all his creatures, and to which all the blessings they enjoy are to be traced. Its province, in regard to sinners, is not to punish them, for this is the province of justice; but to bestow benefits on them to which they have no claim whatever in equity. The act of God, for example, in passing by sinning angels, and in making choice of sinners of the human race as the objects of redeeming mercy, was a spontaneous act of divine sovereignty. He might justly have left our whole race to perish in their sins, as he has left the angels which kept not their first estate. The purpose of God, therefore, to save human transgressors is not the effect of equity, but the result of the sovereign love, the rich mercy, and infinite grace of Jehovah.

In proof that the sovereign love of God is the cause to which the purpose of mercy is to be ascribed, we appeal to those texts of Scripture in which this doctrine is explicitly taught. 'God,' says John, 'so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' And again, 'Herein is love; not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.' (John iii. 16; 1 John iv. 10.) These texts clearly teach us that the mission and work of the Son of God, and the consequent salvation of those who believe on his name, are effects of the sovereign love of God, and

that this, therefore, is the cause to which these events are to be ascribed. Hence says the apostle Paul, 'God has predestinated the saints and the faithful in Christ Jesus unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will'—(Eph. i. 1–4)—that is, according to his sovereign pleasure, or because 'it seemed good in his sight.'

In proof that the sovereign love of God is the cause to which the purpose of mercy is to be ascribed, we further appeal to those texts of scripture in which this doctrine is taught inferentially. 'God saith to Moses,' says Paul, 'I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion; so then, it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy.' (Rom. ix. 15, 16.) And again, 'God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ: by grace are ye saved,' etc. (Eph. ii. 4, 5.) Is it not evident, from these and similar texts, that God actually bestows salvation on sinners in the exercise of his unmerited love and rich mercy; and if so, does it not follow, that the purpose to which this act is to be traced must originate in the sovereignty of his nature?

When we speak of the purpose of mercy, as originating in the sovereignty of God, we do not mean

that it is an arbitrary and capricious purpose, or formed without a good reason. Wisdom, as well as sovereignty, is a perfection of the divine nature; and would it not, therefore, be dishonouring to God, to suppose that he wills a thing simply because he wills it, or that he purposes to act in any case without a reason? No; God does nothing without a good and sufficient reason. The determinations of his will being influenced by his infinite knowledge and goodness, are all founded on the best of reasons, directed to the noblest of ends, and effected by the wisest of means. The reasons why God has purposed to do one thing and not another, are, indeed, often concealed from our view; but we might show, were it necessary, that there is a good reason for everything he does—even the advancement of the general good of the universe, in subordination to the manifestation of his own glory!

SECT. VII.—*The purpose of God to save sinners by Jesus Christ is distinguished by its equity.*

Though the purpose of mercy, as we have shown, does not originate in the justice, but in the sovereignty of God, yet it harmonises in everything with the principles of equity. Its grand object, in regard to sinful men, is a righteous end—to make them perfect, as their Father which is in heaven is perfect, and holy as God is holy. The means appointed for the attainment of this end are also all righteous, and wisely

fitted to illustrate the justice of God, to vindicate the claims of his law, and to maintain and perpetuate the efficiency of his moral government as Lord of all. God obviously, in the exercise of his sovereignty, could not lower the claims of his law to the sinful and imperfect condition of fallen man, for perfect obedience is due to him from every subject of his government; nor could he disannul death, the penalty of transgression, for such an act would be contrary to justice, and a violation of the righteous and immutable principles on which his throne is founded, as a throne of government and law. But he did, in the riches of his sovereignty, as the God of love, purpose that the giving of this obedience, and the endurance of this penalty, should be transferred from sinners themselves to their divinely-appointed surety, our Lord Jesus Christ, and that his all-perfect righteousness should be graciously imputed to them, for their justification by faith unto eternal life. By this wondrous expedient, the claims of equity are all fulfilled, and the throne of God remains untarnished, nay, even shines with a brighter lustre than if all were left to die in their sins. While the purpose of mercy, therefore, originates in the sovereignty of God, it is also characterised by equity, both in its origin and execution. It is a purpose, in consequence of which, says the apostle Paul, 'the righteousness of God is declared, that he might be just, and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus:' and in consequence of which, as

he again says, 'Grace reigns through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.' (Rom. iii. 26; v. 21.)

CHAPTER II.

THE ENDS TO BE ACCOMPLISHED BY THE PURPOSE OF MERCY.

THOUGH the scriptures speak of the purpose of mercy as only one purpose, yet they do not represent it as designed merely to accomplish one object. On the contrary, they teach us that it was formed for the attainment of many great and important ends, in regard to every order of intelligences in the universe—to God himself—to angels, whether evil or good—and to the whole human race.

SECT. I.—*The end of the purpose of mercy in reference to God.*

The object of the purpose of grace in relation to God is to manifest the glory of his character to all his rational offspring. The Most High, as a being of infinite wisdom, always acts with design. In all his purposes and works he has an ultimate end in view. That end is the manifestation of the infinite glory of his nature and perfections: 'For of him, and through

him, *and to him* are all things, to whom be glory for ever, amen.' The Almighty, indeed, cannot purpose or do any thing to make himself more glorious than he is. The glory which belongs to him is necessarily infinite, and therefore incapable of increase. Though, however, it is impossible to augment the essential glory of his character, yet this glory is susceptible of manifestation, and of increasing manifestation, to his intelligent creatures. Now, the manifestation of that glory is the ultimate design of God in all his purposes and works. Is it not, for example, the design of God in his works of creation and providence, to illustrate the glory of his almighty power, and of his infinite wisdom and goodness? Is it not the design of God, in dealing with the evil angels, and in punishing them on account of their sins, to illustrate the glory of his justice, and to teach all intelligent beings that the moral Governor of the universe is not bound to provide a Saviour for those who rebel against his authority, and that he may act equitably without being merciful to the transgressors of his law? And, in regard to the point under consideration, is it not the design of God, in the scheme of redemption, to display the glory of all the moral perfections of his nature, especially the glory of his sovereign mercy in saving many of our race from sin and misery, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus? This is undoubtedly the all-inclusive and ultimate end of the purpose of mercy: 'God hath predestinated us unto the adop-

tion of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, *to the praise of the glory of his grace*, wherein he hath made us accepted in the Beloved.' (Eph. i. 5, 6.)

SECT. II.—*The ends of the purpose of mercy, in reference to the evil and holy angels.*

The ends of the scheme of redemption, in relation to Satan and the hosts of darkness, are to bruise the head of the serpent, as a head of government over man, and to put him under the restraining and controlling power of the Mediator—(Gen. iii. 15; John xii. 31, 32)—to spoil principalities and powers, and to make a show of them openly by the cross of Christ—(Col. ii. 15)—to destroy the works of the devil—(1 John iii. 8)—and to destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil; and deliver them who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage. (Heb. ii. 14, 15.)

The ends of the scheme of redemption, in relation to the holy angels, are to instruct them more fully in the manifold wisdom of God—(Eph. iii. 10)—to put them under the authority of Christ, as mediator, that he may send them forth as his servants, to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation—(Heb. i. 14)—and to augment their happiness. (Luke xv. 10.)

Such are the principal ends to which the purpose of mercy is subservient in relation to God, and to the evil and holy angels. As, however, it is only the

ends of this purpose which God designed to accomplish in regard to man that properly belong to the subject of the present discussion, we pass over those, and proceed to the consideration of this important branch of the subject.

SECT. III.—*The ends of the purpose of mercy in reference to man.*

The ends of the purpose of mercy in relation to the human race are in general two: 1st, To establish the mediatorial form of moral government amongst mankind, and to promulgate the law of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, as the rule by which the conduct of all men ought to be regulated; and, 2dly, To save a certain and definite number of the race from sin and misery, and to bring them eventually to glory by Christ Jesus.

I. *The general end of the purpose of mercy.—The first design of God in the purpose of mercy was to establish the mediatorial form of government amongst men, or to promulgate the law of faith in Christ as the rule by which their conduct ought to be regulated.*

The form of government under which sinners of the human race are placed, since the time when God, in Eden, pronounced the curse on the serpent, is of a mediatorial character. It is true that Adam, after the abrogation of the covenant of works, fell back under the obligations of the law of nature, or of that law by which he was governed in his primeval state. And

it is also true that all his posterity are under the obligations of that law as completely as he was; for it is not possible that man, in any condition of his existence, can be freed from those obligations to believe and obey God which are founded in the relations which he sustains to him as his Creator and moral Governor. It must, however, be observed that the law of nature, which is thus obligatory on all men, is not now addressed to them by God in his absolute character as their Creator and Lord, but by God in his gracious character as the God of salvation. The Most High does not now speak to men directly and immediately, as he did to our first parents before the fall; but reveals his will to them since that event by the Mediator, our Lord Jesus Christ.

In proof of this doctrine, we appeal to the following texts of scripture:—'There is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus.' (1 Tim. ii. 5.) 'The law was ordained by angels in the hand of a Mediator.' (Gal. iii. 19.) 'The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father. . . The Father hath given him authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of Man.' (John v. 22, 23–27.) 'Thou hast given him power over all flesh.' (John xvii. 2.) 'All power,' says Jesus, 'is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations . . . teaching them to observe all

things whatsoever I have commanded you.' (Matt. xxviii. 18–20.) 'Being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ.' (1 Cor. ix. 21.) These texts plainly teach us that the human race, in their fallen state, are under a mediatorial form of government, and that they are now bound to believe and to obey God, not simply according to the law of nature, but according to that law in the mediatorial form of its administration.

The mediatorial form of government was at first revealed to Adam and Eve in Paradise, and progressively to their descendants in after ages of the world, till the canon of scripture was completed, and men enjoyed a full and clear revelation of all things which they were to believe and to do, that they might be saved. This form of moral government consists in two things: *First*, In revelations and laws given by God to men for regulating their belief and actions. *Secondly*, In motives addressed to their hopes and fears, to induce them to believe and to obey him. It is to be perpetuated in the world through all ages, and shall be terminated—and that only as to the present form of its administration—when God, as the governor of the universe, shall call all to judgment at the last day, to reward or punish them according to their works. The rule of this form of government is fully contained in the Bible, and summarily comprehended in these words—'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.' 'This is his commandment,

that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another, as he gave us commandment.' And the motives by which obedience to this rule is enforced are, the threatening of death as the righteous punishment of unbelief, and the promise of life as the gracious reward of faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. 'If ye believe not,' says Christ, 'that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.' (John viii. 24.) 'He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.' (John iii. 36.)

The apostle Paul calls this rule of the mediatorial economy the law of faith, in contradistinction to the law of works. 'Where,' says he, 'is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay, but by the law of faith.' (Rom. iii. 27.) The law of faith agrees with the law of Eden, in that it commands men still to believe whatever God reveals, and to do whatever God commands. It, however, differs from that law in that the promise of eternal life, annexed to it as a motive to obedience, is not to be fulfilled in all men, but only in those who believe on Christ, and that exclusively on the ground of his all-perfect obedience unto death for their sakes; whereas, the promise of eternal life given to Adam, under that economy, would have been fulfilled in the whole human race, without exception, if he had given perfect obedience to the law of works. The law of faith agrees with the law of man's primeval state, ere

he was put into the garden of Eden, in that it commands men still, like that law, to perform the duties which arise out of the relations which they sustain to God and to one another, even to love the Lord their God with all their heart, and with all their soul, and with all their strength, and with all their mind, and their neighbour as themselves; but it differs from that law in that it requires them, as sinful beings, to seek salvation through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, that they may be inclined to keep the law, and fitted to serve God in holiness and righteousness all the days of their life. The mediatorial law does not annul the law of nature, but establishes it. Yea, though God did judicially abrogate the Edenic dispensation as a covenant of works, yet he did not thereby annul the great principles of the religion of nature, on which that dispensation was founded, and which it embodied, namely, that it is the duty of man to believe and to obey the will of his Creator and Lord, in whatever form that will is revealed to him. The rule of the mediatorial dispensation is not, therefore, a new law, but the law of nature and of Paradise administered in a new form, and adapted to the sinful and perishing condition of the human family. According to the immutable obligations of this law, man is as truly bound to believe now what God reveals, and to do what God commands, as he was either in his primeval state or in the garden of Eden. 'Do we make void the law through faith?

God forbid: yea, we establish the law.' (Rom. iii. 31.)

It is further to be observed that the mediatorial dispensation does not reveal to us a different object of faith from that which was exhibited to Adam, either in his primeval state or in Paradise, for God is the only true object of faith under every form of moral government; but it reveals God, as the object of faith, in a new and most interesting aspect of his character, even as 'The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and to the fourth generation.' (Ex. xxxiv. 6, 7.) Thŏugh, however, the mediatorial dispensation does not reveal to us a new object of faith, yet it furnishes us with new subjects of knowledge and belief, even that 'The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, and that God is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.' On these principles, therefore, we conclude that the mediatorial law binds all men to believe and to obey God, not merely as their Creator and Governor, but also in his gracious character as the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and as our God and Father in him; and consequently that it must be

the duty and privilege of every man, however numerous or aggravated his sins may be, to obey this benevolent law of Heaven, and in the obedience of faith 'to come boldly unto the throne of grace, that he may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.'

It is further to be observed that God has placed the whole human race under the government of Jesus Christ as mediator. The Son of God, as mediator, rules over all mankind. He does not merely sustain a special relation to his people, as the head of his body, the church, and their Saviour, as we shall afterwards prove; but he also sustains a general relation to the whole family of man as the Saviour of sinners, their Lawgiver and Judge. JESUS CHRIST IS CONSTITUTED A HEAD OF GOVERNMENT TO THE RACE. All are under law to him as Mediator.

1. In proof of this doctrine, we appeal to those texts of scripture which affirm that *the Father has given him power over all mankind.* 'Thou,' says Jesus, 'hast given me power over all flesh.' And again, 'All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.' The word translated 'power' in these texts, is not δυναμις, strength, ability to act, but εξουσια, authority, jurisdiction; and denotes, not the almighty power which belongs to the Saviour as a divine person, but the delegated authority with which he is invested as the Father's servant. It is power *given* to him. Now, we might show that this grant of authority or jurisdiction embraces the whole kingdom of providence,

and extends to all things in heaven, in earth, and in hell; but it is sufficient for our present purpose to observe, that it includes all men, both those that shall be eventually saved, and those that shall be lost. And is it not unmistakeably evident, both from the universal terms of the passage itself, and also from the nature of the command which Christ immediately after gives to his apostles, saying, 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature,' that he therein reveals himself to man as invested by the Father with a power to publish the gospel, and to rule as mediator over all the inhabitants of the earth?

2. In proof that all men are under law to Christ as mediator, we appeal to those texts of scripture *in which God commands all men to believe and obey him.* 'Be wise now,' says God, 'O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth. . . . Kiss the Son lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him.' (Ps. ii. 10–12.) 'God,' says the apostle Paul, 'commands all men everywhere to repent.' (Acts xvii. 30.) 'Go ye,' says Christ, 'and teach all nations, . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.' (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.) Now, if all men are bound to believe on Christ, and to keep his commandments, does not this prove that they must be the subjects of his mediatorial government?

3. In proof that all men are under law to Jesus as

mediator, we also appeal to those texts of scripture which teach us *that he will judge all men at the last day, and punish those who refuse to submit themselves to his authority and law.* All men, whether they have been favoured with the means of salvation or otherwise, 'must appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or evil.' And the apostle Paul assures us that the Mediator, as Judge of all, shall then 'take vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.' Now, if the ignorant and disobedient of our race shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, it follows that they must as truly be the subjects of his mediatorial government as those who are saved, and that they shall then suffer punishment because they wilfully refused to submit to his authority, and to trust in him for salvation according to his commandments. Hence in that day the Judge shall say to them, 'These mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me.'

On the whole, we conclude from these texts of scripture that the human race, without exception, are under the mediatorial government of the Lord Jesus Christ, and responsible to him as their lawgiver and judge. Some may object to this conclusion, on the supposition that it is contrary to the principles of

equity to represent all men as responsible to the Mediator, seeing the revelation of Christ and the mediatorial law of faith have neither, in past times nor in the present day, been published universally amongst mankind.

The limited publication of the gospel in the world is certainly an undeniable fact in the history of divine providence. We, however, for the three following reasons, deny that this fact is inconsistent with the dominion of Christ as mediator over all mankind, and their consequent responsibility to him as their lawgiver and judge:—

1. *The ignorance of the way of salvation through Christ which has existed, and which still exists, in the world, is exclusively the result of man's abuse of that dispensation of mercy with which the Almighty has favoured the human race.* Were not all the inhabitants of the world during the lifetime of our first parents favoured with a revelation of the mercy of God through the promised seed of the woman? And in the days before the flood, when all flesh had corrupted his way 'upon the earth,' did not God interpose, by an awful visitation of his providence, for the preservation of his truth, and of the ordinances of salvation among the children of men? Were not Noah and his family for some time after the flood the sole inhabitants of the earth, and did not all men in that age also enjoy the means of grace? Now, if God in the days of our first parents, and a second

time in the days of Noah after the deluge, favoured all the inhabitants of the earth with a revelation of his character as the God of mercy, and established amongst them the means of salvation—if God, as we might show, bestowed these privileges on the fathers of the human family, not merely for their own eternal welfare, but also as a precious trust which they were to transmit to posterity, that the generations to come might know God, and seek salvation through the promised Messiah—if all the fathers of the human race had been faithful to this important trust which was committed to their keeping—and if they had made known the testimony of God to their children from generation to generation, as in duty they were bound to do, 'that these might set their hope in God, and not forget the works of God, but keep his commandments:' is it not evident that darkness would never have covered the earth, and gross darkness the people; but that every tribe of the race would have uninterruptedly enjoyed the light of supernatural revelation? The world's ignorance of the true God and of the way of salvation through Christ, cannot therefore be ascribed either to the agency of God or to the nature and tendencies of the mediatorial dispensation as its cause, but to the wickedness of men —to their contempt and abuse of its invaluable privileges and blessings—and to their violation of its holy, and just, and good laws. Hence, in assigning a reason for the ignorance and wickedness of the heathen

world, an apostle says, 'They did not like to retain God in their knowledge. When they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations.' (Rom. i. 21, 28.) In the words of the Psalmist, 'The heathen are sunk down in the pit that they made; in the net which they hid is their own foot taken.' (Ps. ix. 15.)

2. *The Mediator leaves many nations of the earth, and multitudes who are nominally christian, in that state of ignorance into which they have brought themselves by rejecting his gospel, as a punishment on account of their sin in this matter.* When men who are favoured with the gospel do not 'like to retain God in their knowledge,' he judicially punishes them for their sin, by leaving them to walk in their own ways. 'God,' says Paul, 'gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient.' (Rom. i. 28.) When they wilfully refuse to hearken to his voice, he ceases to strive with them by his Spirit, and judicially gives them up to the counsels of their own evil hearts: 'My people,' says God, 'would not hearken to my voice; and Israel would none of me. So I gave them up unto their own hearts' lust: and they walked in their own counsels.' (Ps. lxxxi. 11, 12.) 'Ephraim is joined to his idols; let him alone.' (Hos. iv. 17.)

Now, if God at two different epochs in the history of the world favoured all its inhabitants with a revelation of the gospel— if certain tribes of the human race,

in after ages, came to be ignorant of the way of salvation through a Redeemer, because of their abuse of this act of divine goodness, and because they did not like to retain God in their knowledge—and if the Mediator, as their moral governor, has for ages left them to walk in their own counsels, as a spiritual judgment on account of their sins; it follows that the limited publication of the gospel is in perfect harmony with the principles of equity, seeing he has withdrawn that blessing from many people, which, as a sovereign gift, he is bound to bestow on none, because they abused it, and would not have him to reign over them. And it also follows that all heathen nations are under the mediatorial government of Christ Jesus the Lord, seeing he inflicts judgments on them in consequence of their sins. (Ps. cx. 5, 6.)

3. *The Mediator, in reigning over the inhabitants of heathen nations who never heard the gospel, governs them according to the law of nature.* Christ Jesus the Lord reigns as mediator over all the nations of the earth, even over those nations who have not heard the glad tidings of salvation. 'God,' says the Psalmist, 'is gone up with a shout, the Lord with the sound of a trumpet. Sing praises to God, sing praises; sing praises unto our King, sing praises. For God is the King of all the earth. . . . God reigneth over the heathen: God sitteth upon the throne of his holiness.' (Ps. xlvii. 5–8.) It will not be denied that this passage refers to our Lord Jesus Christ. These

words, 'God is gone up with a shout, the Lord with the sound of a trumpet,' undoubtedly predict the triumphant ascension of the Saviour to heaven; and the Psalmist, in the subsequent verses, distinctly affirms that he, as Immanuel, 'is the King of all the earth, and reigneth over the heathen.' Now, what is the law by which Christ, as King of all the earth, reigneth over the heathen, and by which he shall eventually judge them? It cannot be the mediatorial law of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, for this law is not revealed to them; and it does appear to be inconsistent with the principles of equity to suppose that the Saviour shall judge them by a law of which they are ignorant, not in consequence of their own sins, but in consequence of the sins of their fathers, in not transmitting to them the knowledge of it. But the law by which he reigns over the heathen is the law of nature, revealed to them in the works of creation and providence, and written on their heart by the finger of God. Though this law may not be at all, or only partially developed in their conscience, yet their ignorance of it, arising as this does from the depravity of the heart and from their non-improvement of the means of knowing it which they enjoy, forms no valid excuse for their unbelief and disobedience. Hence we find, when converted to christianity, that they do not regard themselves as freed from the guilt of their past sins in consequence of their ignorance; but, on the contrary, that they feel this guilt as a grievous burden

pressing on their conscience, and seek deliverance from it through the blood of the cross.

That Jesus Christ governs all heathen nations by the law of nature, is evident from the consideration that this is the rule by which he is to judge them at the last day. 'As many,' says the apostle Paul, 'as have sinned without law (that is, without a knowledge of the mediatorial law of faith), shall also perish without law, in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel. For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another.' (Rom. ii. 12–16.)

These laws, the law of nature or of conscience, and the law of faith in Christ or of gospel revelation, however, it must be observed, are not different laws, but essentially the same. Under the government of the Mediator, there is only one moral law for the whole family of man, and all, in every condition of their existence, are bound to believe in God, and to do his will as he makes it known to them. There are, indeed, under his government, different degrees of responsibility, but these do not arise from any difference or change in the law, but from a difference in their privileges and means of knowing it. Though

it is a principle of the divine government that greater privileges involve greater responsibility, yet no man is or can be freed on this account from the obligations of the moral law by which Christ as mediator governs the world. (Luke xii. 41–48.) Man may lose by sin his religious consciousness, but he can never thereby divest himself of his moral consciousness, and cease to have a sense of his obligations to keep the law which God has written on the table of his heart. Now, if Christ as mediator reigns over the heathen, and is at last to judge them according to the law of nature, or the moral law, it follows that they are as truly responsible to him, as their lawgiver and judge, as those are to whom he has sent the word of salvation, and consequently that the whole human race, without exception, are under the mediatorial government of the Lord Jesus Christ.

If God, then, as we have endeavoured to show, has established and promulgated the mediatorial form of government among mankind, and if he commands sinners indiscriminately 'to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, that they may be saved,' it follows that he must have purposed to do so from eternity; for everything that he does in time is the effect of an eternal purpose. And if he purposed to publish the law of faith in Christ as the rule by which all to whom the word of salvation is sent should be regulated, it also follows that the mediatorial dispensation, in its very nature, must be a system of moral government, and

that its establishment in the world must constitute an important end of the purpose of mercy in reference to man. The salvation of all believers is, no doubt, the chief design of God in that purpose; but the promulgation of the mediatorial law amongst mankind also accomplishes many important objects in regard to the race in subordination to that end. Does it not, for example, place sinners of the human family in a different position from that of the evil angels for whom no Saviour has been provided? Does it not address them as the slaves of sin and Satan, and obnoxious to the wrath to come, and tell them that their condition, though pitiable, is not one of irremediable bondage and wretchedness—that they are 'prisoners of hope?' Does it not illustrate the goodness of God in providing a great and a free salvation for the guilty sons of men, in erecting his throne of mercy in the midst of them, and in giving them, indiscriminately, the privilege of access to him as the God of salvation? Does it not render the throne of mercy accessible to the chief of sinners, and place salvation within the reach of all? Does it not illustrate the supremacy of God as the moral governor of man, in putting them under the dominion of his Son as mediator, and in commanding them to hear him in all things whatsoever he shall say unto them? And does it not, by its revelations, and precepts, and sanctions, benevolently place all those to whom it is addressed under the most powerful obligations, as accountable agents,

to seek salvation through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus?

The proclamation of the mediatorial law, or, which is the same thing, the external call of the gospel, is made to mankind by God, as the supreme ruler over all, and is addressed to their understanding and heart, neither as elect nor non-elect, but simply as sinners and the subjects of his government, and binds all to regard it as the rule by which their conduct in every thing should be regulated. It is founded on the relation which subsists between God as a moral governor, and men as the subjects of his government; and it furnishes all of them in common with objective means of salvation, suitable to their condition, and fitted to influence them, as endowed with reason and freedom of choice, to act according to its requirements. Here this end terminates, and the mediatorial dispensation, viewed as a system of moral government, stands completed. Hence the apostle James calls it the perfect law of liberty (James i. 25), and addresses all who are favoured with a revelation of the gospel, saying, 'So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty.' (Chap. ii. 12.)

II. *The special end of the purpose of mercy.—The second design of God in the purpose of mercy in regard to man is to save a definite number of the race from sin and misery, and to bring them to glory.*

The design of God in the plan of redemption is not to save sinners of the human race universally. If

this were his design, then all men, without exception, would eventually be saved; for, says God, 'my counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure.' But we know from the word of God, that many of the race shall wilfully persist in rebellion against God in the present life, and be condemned in the judgment of the last day, on account of their sins, to depart from Christ into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. Besides, if it were the design of God to save all men, should not all in every age and place of the world have enjoyed a revelation of Christ, and the other means of grace? Should not these means have been invariably accompanied with the gracious influences of the Spirit to render them effectual for salvation? And would not men universally have been found walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless? But we know from history and observation, as well as from the word of God, that many tribes of the human race, both in past and present times, have not heard the joyful sound of the gospel, yea, that many of those to whom Christ is preached refuse to hear and obey him, and obstinately continue to walk in the broad way of unbelief and sin, which leadeth to destruction, in direct opposition to the benevolent laws and counsels of Infinite Wisdom. From these undeniable facts in the history of our race, it is evidently not the design of God to save all men. On the contrary, the scriptures teach us *that his chief*

end, in the purpose of mercy in regard to man, is to save only those in every age and place of the world who improve the means of grace which they enjoy under the mediatorial dispensation—who come to the Lord Jesus Christ—and who put their trust in him for pardon and eternal life.

1. In proof of this doctrine, we appeal to the very nature of the mediatorial dispensation. Though under this economy God commands sinners indiscriminately to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ that they may be saved, yet he does not promise to save all men, but only such of them as believe in Jesus. No person will call this statement in question who candidly considers the following texts of scripture:—'This is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day.' (John vi. 40.) 'Behold, I lay in Zion a stumbling-stone and rock of offence: and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.' (Rom. ix. 33.) 'To him give all the prophets witness, that, through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.' (Acts x. 43.) 'Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.' (Rom. x. 13.) 'If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.' (John viii. 24.) 'He that believeth, and is baptised, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.' (Mark xvi. 16.) Now if, according to these passages of scripture, God does not promise to

save all men, but only those 'who call upon the name of the Lord' for this blessing—if he does not promise remission of sins and everlasting life to every man, but only to him who believes in Jesus; then it is evident, from the very nature of the mediatorial dispensation, that it was his design, in the purpose of mercy, to save only such of the race as would come unto him by Christ, and consequently that all those shall be saved who act in harmony with this design, while those who will not come to Christ that they might have life must inevitably perish in their sins.

2. In proof that it is the design of God, in the purpose of mercy, to save only a definite number of our race, we appeal to those texts of scripture which speak of them as persons who were *chosen by God to salvation* before the world began, and ordained to eternal life. 'We are bound,' says the apostle Paul, 'to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth.' (2 Thess. ii. 13.) 'Whom God did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified.' (Rom. viii. 29, 30.) 'And,' says the historian of the Acts of the Apostles, 'as many as were ordained to eternal

life believed.' (Acts xiii. 48.) These texts distinctly teach us that God in eternity did not decree to save all men, but a definite number of the race, even those whom he chose to salvation, 'according to the good pleasure of his will.'

3. In proof that it is the design of God in the purpose of mercy to save only a definite number of our race, we appeal to those texts of scripture which speak of them as persons who were *chosen in Christ*, or given to him, that they should be holy and without blame before him in love. The purposes of God always include the means of their accomplishment. Hence we find that those who shall be saved were not merely chosen to salvation, but that they were also chosen in Christ, or given to him, that he might, by means of his mediatory acts, bring them to glory. 'Blessed,' says an apostle, 'be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ; according as he hath *chosen us in him* before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children *by Jesus Christ* to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will.' (Eph. i. 3–5.) 'Thou hast given him (that is the Son) power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.' (John xvii. 2.) It is evident from these texts that it was not all men, but only a definite number of our race, who were

given by the Father to the Son or chosen in Christ—even those who become the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, and who are blessed with spiritual blessings in him.

4. In proof that it is the design of God, in the purpose of mercy, to save only a definite number of our race, we appeal to those texts of scripture which speak of them as persons for whom the Lord Jesus Christ *intentionally gave his life and makes intercession that he might save them.* One end, no doubt, as we shall show in the proper place, for which Jesus became obedient unto death, was that the mediatorial form of government might be established among mankind generally; but he also died for the special purpose of bestowing eternal life on as many as the Father gave him. 'For their sakes,' says he, (that is, for the apostles, and for them also who shall believe on him through their word, as the context shows,) 'I sanctify myself, (I consecrate myself to the work of redemption,) that they also might be sanctified through the truth.' (John xvii. 19.) 'I am the good shepherd, . . . and I lay down my life for the sheep.' (John x. 14, 15.) 'Husbands love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it, with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy, and without blemish.' (Eph. v. 25–27.) These

texts plainly teach us that Christ has a special love to a definite number of the human race, and that 'he gave himself for them, that he might redeem them from all iniquity, and purify unto himself *a peculiar people*, zealous of good works.' No casuist, however dexterous in misinterpreting scripture, can ever reconcile these passages with the Arminian dogma that Christ died equally, or in every sense, for all men.

Jesus, however, did not only die to save his people from their sins; but he also makes intercession for their salvation. 'I pray not,' says Christ, 'for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine. Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word.' (John xvii. 9, 20.) 'Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost *that come unto God by him*, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.' (Heb. vii. 25.) These texts evidently prove that Christ does not intercede for the salvation of all men, but only for the salvation of those who were given to him of the Father, and who come to him by faith. If he were to pray for all men, would not all men in this case eventually be saved? for him the Father heareth always. (John xi. 42.)

5. In proof that it is the design of God in the purpose of mercy to save only a definite number of our race, we appeal to those texts of scripture which speak of them as persons to whom *the Holy Spirit imparts his special and efficacious influences.* Though

the Holy Spirit, in the bible and ordinances of the gospel, unquestionably gives to all men, as sinners and the subjects of the divine government, an objective revelation of the Saviour, and calls them to come to him that they may find rest to their souls, yet he does not bestow those efficacious influences which secure salvation upon all to whom that call is addressed, but only, as the following passages teach us, upon those who hearken to his counsels and turn at his reproofs: 'Wisdom crieth without; she uttereth her voice in the streets: . . . How long, ye simple ones, will ye love simplicity? and the scorners delight in their scorning, and fools hate knowledge? Turn you at my reproof: behold, I will pour out my Spirit unto you, I will make known my words unto you.' (Prov. i. 20–23.) 'If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children; how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?' (Luke xi. 13.) Now, if God, as these texts teach us, does not pour out the Holy Spirit in his special and saving influences on those who hate knowledge—who will not turn at his reproof—who refuse to ask the Holy Spirit, and who in general disregard the call of the gospel; and if many to whom that call is addressed do unreasonably and perversely act in this criminal manner, while as rational beings they have the power of acting otherwise, is it not evident that these influences are not imparted to all men, but only to a definite number of

our race—to those who turn at God's reproof, and who seek them by earnest and persevering prayer? If the efficacious influences of the Spirit were bestowed on all men, would not all be saved?

6. In further proof that it is the design of God in the purpose of mercy to save only a definite number of the human race, we appeal to those texts of scripture which speak of them *as persons distinguished from the seed of the serpent by their character and practice.* Those who are saved are called in the scriptures God's elect—the disciples of Christ—believers—saints—the fearers and servants of the Lord—the children of God—heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ; in contradistinction from those who shall die in their sins—who refuse to learn the lessons of truth and salvation at Christ's feet—who disbelieve God's word—who are unholy—who neither fear the Lord nor do him service—who are the children of the devil, and who shall be eternally associated with him and his angels in suffering the torments of hell. Now if, as we might show, the righteous have been made to differ in this manner from the wicked in their principles and practices by the grace of God, which they sought and received, and if each of them must say with Paul, 'by the grace of God I am what I am,' does it not follow that it was the design of God, in the purpose of mercy, to bestow this grace, not on all men, but on such of their number as should diligently observe the ordinances of salvation which he has

appointed as the channel of its communication to sinners, and which he has promised to bless to them, as the means of finding grace to help in time of need? The salvation of sinners stands connected not merely with the agency of God in providing a Saviour for them, and in instituting means of grace among them, but also with their personal agency in coming to Christ through these means, according to the divine commandment.

7. In proof that it is the design of God in the purpose of mercy to save only a definite number of our race, we appeal to those texts of scripture which speak of the *final results of the administration of the mediatorial dispensation.* The mediatorial economy, in regard to the present form of its administration, is to be consummated at the last day. In the events of that day all of every order of intelligent beings shall perceive the objects which God designed to accomplish in the formation of the purpose of mercy, and the ends to which every thing in the administration of the mediatorial economy was subservient. It shall then be seen that the whole human race are not saved, and that many of their number in all generations would not have Christ to reign over them; but in ignorance and folly preferred to continue in the service of sin and Satan, and, consequently, under the curse of the law. 'When the Son of man,' says Christ, 'shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory:

and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal. (Matt. xxv. 31–34, 41, 46.) Now if, according to this revelation of the events that shall take place at the last day, it is certain that only a definite number of our race are to be saved, and that the rest are to be punished for their sins; and if, as might be shown, no design of God can be frustrated, does it not follow that it must have been the design of God in the scheme of redemption, and of Christ in the administration of the mediatorial economy, to save not all mankind, but only that innumerable and glorious company which he will set on his right hand in the judgment of the great day, and who shall be ever with the Lord? If, then, these passages of scripture, to which we have appealed, clearly prove that it is the design of God, in the purpose of mercy, not to save all mankind, but a definite number of the race—even all those who shall believe on Christ according to

the law of the mediatorial economy; what, we are naturally led to inquire, is the nature of that salvation which, in the execution of this design, he shall actually bestow on them? As, however, the discussion of this subject would detain the reader too long, we shall not enter on it, farther than to observe, that it consists in a deliverance from sin and all its penal consequences, unto holiness and all its blissful accompaniments and results. It is the design of God, in the plan of salvation, to make all his people perfectly holy and perfectly happy, and that for ever and ever in the kingdom of glory.

Under the Edenic dispensation, perseverance in holiness constituted the means by which eternal life was to be obtained; but under the mediatorial dispensation, holiness is the end to which all things in its arrangements in reference to man are subservient, and in which they shall eventually result in the experience of those who believe. It is an error to suppose, as many do, that holiness is a means of salvation. Holiness itself is salvation, and salvation is holiness. The salvation of man consists in his deliverance from sin, and in his transformation into the image of God. Has not the Most High predestinated the people whom he calls according to his purpose, 'to be conformed to the image of his Son?' Were they not chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, that they should be holy and without blame before him in love? Did not the Saviour

die 'to redeem them from all iniquity?' Has he not given them the holy scriptures, 'that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works?' Has he not commanded his servants to preach Christ, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom, that they may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus?' Has he not 'given them the Holy Ghost to purify their hearts by faith, to show them the glory of the Lord, and to change them into the same image from glory to glory?' And shall he not, in that great day when 'he shall appear the second time without sin unto salvation, present them all to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, but holy and without blemish?' If these things are so, then we conclude that the grand design of God in the purpose of mercy in regard to his people, is to make them perfectly holy, and thus to fit them for glorifying and enjoying him for ever and ever in the kingdom of heaven.

The Redeemer will accomplish this great end in regard to the souls of his people at the time of death. He will then make their spirits perfect, and conduct them to Paradise by the ministry of angels. And he will accomplish this end in regard to their bodies at the last day. He shall then raise them from the grave in incorruption, in glory, and in power. He shall then reunite their vile bodies, thus raised, and changed, and fashioned like unto his

glorious body, to their glorified spirits. And when he has thus redeemed them in their whole man, and transformed them entirely into his own image, he will conduct them in triumph to glory, and cause them to shine forth as the sun, in all the radiance of intellectual light and moral purity, in the kingdom of their Father, and that for ever and ever. 'Beloved, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.' In the morning of the resurrection day, and for ever afterwards, the saints of God shall be satisfied with the Redeemer's likeness.

On the whole, there appear to be two great ends of the purpose of mercy in regard to the human race: *First*, To establish and promulgate the mediatorial form of government among men, as the rule by which their conduct ought to be regulated; and, *Secondly*, To save a definite portion of their number from sin and misery, and to bring them to glory. The first of these objects is in its nature universal, and has a reference to the condition of the human race as fallen in Adam, and the subjects of the divine government, and places all men under the dominion of the Son of God as mediator, and within the reach of pardon. The second is particular, and has a reference to God's chosen people, and secures the salvation of all who give to him the obedience of faith. If, then, the design of God in the plan of mercy in regard to the

human race is thus twofold, it follows that it must be unscriptural to maintain, as one class of theologians do, that the design of God in the purpose of mercy is exclusively universal, and that, as the God of love, he does no more for any man than he does for all men; and equally so to maintain, as another class do, that his design in that purpose is exclusively particular, and merely to save his elected people. Both of these theories, as we have seen, are at variance with the word of God, and with unquestionable facts in the history of his providence. The truth of this statement, however, will appear still more evident as we proceed in our inquiries regarding the means by which these ends were to be accomplished.

CHAPTER III.

THE MEANS BY WHICH THE PURPOSE OF MERCY IS TO BE ACCOMPLISHED.

THE means by which the purpose of mercy is accomplished, may be comprehended, as it appears to us, under four general observations:

I. The purpose of mercy is accomplished by means of the formation of new relations between the three persons of the Godhead themselves, and between these and fallen men;

II. By means of the covenant transactions between the Father, as sustaining the majesty and rights of Deity, and the Son, as constituted the Father's servant and our representative;

III. By means of the work which the Son of God accomplished on earth, in fulfilling the condition of the covenant of grace; and

IV. By means of the work which he performs in heaven in the administration of that covenant.

SECT. I.—*The purpose of mercy is accomplished by means of the formation or assumption of new relations between the three persons of the Godhead themselves, and between these and fallen men.*

The three persons of the Godhead, in the accomplishment of the purpose of mercy, appear to have formed new and gracious relations between themselves and fallen man. The names of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, by which God reveals himself to us in the scriptures, indicate the existence, and unfold the nature of these relations. Though these names, probably, like the names Jehovah and Almighty, refer to God in his absolute and essential character as Creator and Lord of all, and indicate relations which necessarily exist between the three persons of the Godhead; yet certainly they have a peculiar reference to the relations which these persons sustain to each other, and to man in the economy of redemption, and to the works which they severally perform according

to these relations for effecting the ends of that economy. The truth of this conclusion is established by the appointed form of baptism (Matt. xxviii. 19), and also by the apostolic benediction, (2 Cor. xiii. 14.) Converts to christianity and their children are neither to be baptised, nor are men to be blessed, in the name of God in his absolute character as Jehovah and the Almighty, but in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; that is, in the name of the triune God in his gracious or new covenant character as the God of salvation.

The three persons of the Godhead, in consequence of the gracious formation of new relations between themselves and fallen man, perform distinct works in these relations for the accomplishment of the purpose of salvation. Though they all co-operate in the work of redemption as one God, yet sustaining distinct characters according to the order of their subsistence and their distinct personality in the Godhead, each person performs works peculiar to himself, which unitedly effectuate the manifestation of their common glory in the salvation of believers and in the condemnation of unbelievers. For example, it is the peculiar work of the Father to send his Son into the world that he might yield obedience unto death for the salvation of sinners. It is the peculiar work of the Son to come into the world, as sent by the Father, to give his life a ransom for many, and to make intercession for the transgressors. And it is the peculiar work of

the Holy Spirit, as the Spirit of Christ, to reveal the will of God to men for their salvation; and through its instrumentality, in connection with their personal agency, to justify, to regenerate, and sanctify all who are brought to glory. Now if each person of the Godhead performs these and other distinct acts in the work of redemption, are we not warranted to conclude that they all sustain distinct relations to each other, and act harmoniously in different characters in executing that work, and also that those distinct acts are the result of their united arrangements in the council of peace?

It appears to have been the will of the three persons in the Godhead, that the Father should sustain, in the economy of redemption, the character of their representative, and act not merely in his own name but also in the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost —that in this economical character he should sustain the majesty and rights of Deity—that he should manifest the infinite love, and mercy, and purity, of the divine nature by appointing the Son as his servant and our representative, 'to offer himself once in the end of the world to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself;'—and that he should reward him for his obedience unto death by exalting him with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins, and by appointing him to judge the world at the last day. When, however, the scriptures ascribe the mission of the Son into

our world, and the gift of salvation through him to the love of the Father, these expressions are not to be understood as referring to the Father personally and exclusively, but to him in his economical character as the representative of the other persons of the Godhead. Salvation originates as truly in the love of the Son and Spirit as of the Father.

It appears to have been the will of the three persons of the Godhead, that the Son, in the economy of redemption, should become the Mediator between God and sinful men;—that as mediator he should sustain and act in a twofold character, namely, as the Father's servant and officially subject to him, and as the representative of a peculiar people;—and that he should in these characters at the fulness of time take a holy human nature in union to his divine person, and perform in that nature whatever things were necessary to be done and suffered, for the manifestation of the glory of God in the salvation of sinful and perishing men.

It appears also to have been the will of the three persons of the Godhead, that the Holy Spirit should create that human nature which the Son was to take in union to the divine;—that he should sustain that nature, and qualify the Saviour, as man, by supernatural gifts and influences, for the performance of the work to which he was officially appointed;—that he should proceed from the Father and the Son to abide in the church for ever;—and that he should in

this gracious character, as the Spirit of the Father and of Christ, actually favour the world with a revelation of divine and saving truth, and that through its instrumentality he should also justify, regenerate, sanctify, and lead into the land of uprightness all the heirs of promise.

Now, if the three persons of the Godhead sustain distinct relations to one another, and if they perform distinct works in the scheme of redemption, are we not warranted to conclude that these relations and works are the result of their united arrangements in the council of peace, and the ordained means for accomplishing the purpose of grace? 'God,' says the apostle Paul, 'worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.'

We shall not detain the reader by inquiring into the nature of all those relations which exist between the persons of the Godhead themselves, and between these and fallen man, and which we have briefly adverted to. But we cannot pass over the consideration of those relations which the Son sustains to God and to man in the economy of redemption. A knowledge of these relations is necessary that we may obtain a scriptural and consistent view of the means by which the purpose of mercy is accomplished, and that we may be able to detect and expose the errors which some entertain in regard to the works of Christ and of the Holy Spirit. The relations which the Son of God as mediator sustains, and in which he acts in

the economy of redemption, as we have already said, are of a twofold character: *First*, He is *the Father's servant*, and officially subject to him; and, *Secondly*, He is *the representative of a peculiar people.*

I. *It is the will of the three persons of the Godhead that the Son should act in the economy of redemption as the Father's servant.*

1. In proof of the truth of the proposition, that it is the will of the three persons of the Godhead that the Son should act in the economy of redemption as the Father's servant, we appeal to those texts of scripture in which the Redeemer is explicitly called the Father's servant: 'It is a light thing that thou shouldst be *my servant*, to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel; I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the ends of the earth.' (Isa. xlix. 6.) 'Behold, *my servant* shall deal prudently, he shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high.' (Isa. lii. 13.) 'By his knowledge shall my *righteous servant* justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities.' (Isa. liii. 11.) 'Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but *to minister*, and to give his life a ransom for many.' (Matt. xx. 27, 28.) It is plain from these, and similar texts of scripture, that the Son of God, as mediator, sustains a relation to the Father as his servant; and that, in executing the mediatorial offices of a prophet, priest, and king, he

invariably acts in this character, and as in a state of subjection to him. When, however, our Lord Jesus Christ is called in scripture the Father's servant, this language, it must be observed, does not mean that the second person of the Godhead is *essentially* subject to the first, for he is the co-equal of the Father in wisdom, power, and in all divine perfections; but it means that he is *officially* subordinate to the Father according to voluntary and gracious arrangements between the three persons of the Godhead, and that for the purpose of manifesting the glory of the triune God in the salvation of perishing sinners. Hence Christ says, in reference to the former of these relations, 'I and my Father are one;' and in reference to the latter, 'My Father is greater than I.'

2. In proof that it was the will of the three persons of the Godhead that the Son in the economy of redemption should act as the Father's servant, we appeal to those passages of scripture which speak of the work which he performed during his state of humiliation on earth, as work done by him as a servant in obedience to the will of the Father: 'I came down,' says Christ, 'from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.' (John vi. 38.) 'I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me.' (John v. 30.) 'My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work.' (John iv. 34.) 'No man taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power

to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father.' (John x. 18.) 'I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak.' (John xii. 49.) It is plain from these texts that the Father, as officially sustaining the majesty and rights of the Godhead, appointed the Lord Jesus Christ to reveal the plan of mercy, and to give his life for the salvation of sinners; and that Christ did perform these works in obedience to the will of the Father, and as sent into the world for these purposes. And if so, the conclusion is irresistible, that the Son in the economy of redemption sustains and acts in the relation of a servant to the Father.

3. Finally, that it was the will of the three persons in the Godhead that the Son in the economy of redemption should act as the Father's servant, we appeal to those texts of scripture which speak of the honours to which Christ is exalted in heaven as the reward of his obedience in giving his life a ransom for many. The scriptures teach us that the Father promised to glorify the Son as mediator, and to exalt him to ineffable honour and blessedness in heaven as the reward of his ministry in humbling himself, and in becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the cross: 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. Thou wilt show me the path of life: in thy

presence is fulness of joy; at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore.' (Ps. xvi. 10, 11.) 'Thou hast made him most blessed for ever: thou hast made him exceeding glad with thy countenance.' (Ps. xxi. 6.) 'I will make him my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth. His seed also will I make to endure for ever, and his throne as the days of heaven.' (Ps. lxxxix. 27, 29.) These and similar texts of scripture reveal to us the joy that was set before Christ, and for which he endured the cross and despised its shame. On this joy he has entered, being now 'set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens.' But the Father has conferred this honour and blessedness on Christ as the reward of his obedience unto death. 'This Jesus,' says the apostle Peter, 'hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear.' (Acts ii. 32, 33.) If, then, the Father has glorified the Son as mediator, in consequence of his obedience unto death, it follows that the Son in that work acted as the Father's servant. If it were otherwise, how could the glory to which he is exalted in heaven be represented in the scriptures as the reward of the services which he performed in his state of humiliation on earth?

On the whole, it is evident from those texts of

scripture to which we have appealed, that in the economy of redemption the Son sustains and acts in the relation of a servant to the Father. And if so, we conclude that it must have been the will of the three persons of the Godhead in eternity that the Son should sustain and act in this relation in that economy. It is by contemplating, as we have endeavoured to do, those relations which the persons of the Godhead sustain to each other, and those acts which in these relations they respectively perform in the work of redemption, that we can best ascertain the means which they adopted in the council of peace for accomplishing the purpose of mercy.

II. *It was the will of the three persons of the Godhead that the Son, in the economy of redemption, should act as the representative of a 'peculiar people.'*

Our Lord Jesus Christ does not merely act in the economy of redemption as the Father's servant, but he also acts as the representative of sinners. A representative is one who sustains a relation in law to those whom he represents, and who is empowered to act in their name and for their interests. Now, did the three persons of the Godhead in the council of peace constitute such a relation as this between the Son as mediator and sinful men? This question is of fundamental importance in theological science, and the right determination of it is essentially necessary to direct our inquiries regarding the transactions between the Father and Mediator in the covenant of

grace, and in regard to the nature, the extent and results of his work as the great high priest of the covenant. In the consideration of it we shall *first* inquire whether Christ, as the high priest of the covenant, acted in a representative character, or not? and, *secondly*, if he sustains a representative relation to sinners, whether is he the representative of all men without exception, or of a definite number of the human race? If the scriptures teach us that the Son of God, as the high priest of the covenant, acted as the representative of a definite number of our race, then, reasoning from the effect to the cause, we are obviously warranted to conclude that it was his own will and the will of the other persons of the Godhead that he should, in laying down his life according to the commandment of the Father, act in this character.

First, Did Christ in giving obedience unto death act in a representative character, or not? In reply to this question we affirm, that the Son of God, in giving obedience unto death, as the high priest of the covenant, acted in the character of a representative.

1. The truth of this proposition is evident from the very constitution of his mediatorial character. The constitution of the mediatorial character of the Son of God consists in the divine purpose, that he should assume this office, and act in this capacity, for the salvation of sinners. As he was to mediate between God and man, it was necessary that he should be a

partaker both of the nature of God and also of the nature of man. Unless the Mediator were a partaker of the human nature, he could not obey the law which we had violated, nor suffer its penalty; for the divine nature, viewed abstractly, can neither obey nor suffer; and unless he were God, his obedience and sufferings could not have been of infinite value, and transferable to the account of sinners as the means of their salvation. Hence we find that the Son of God, at the fulness of time, took to himself the human nature in both of its constituent elements—a true body and a reasonable soul. The nature of man, however, which he then assumed had no distinct personality. It was only mysteriously united to the second person of the Godhead. The divine purpose that the Word should be made flesh, and the accomplishment of that purpose, no doubt changed his relations to the Father and to sinners; but his personality being one and indivisible, remained unaffected by this change of relationship in regard to those parties between whom he was to mediate. Hence the scriptures invariably speak of the Mediator as one person, and also of the acts which he performs, both in the divine and human natures, as the acts of one person.

It is evident, from the very constitution and nature of Christ's mediatorial character, that his obedience unto the death of the cross could not have been given on his own account, but must have been given by him exclusively for others. Had the Saviour been a mere

man he would necessarily have been bound to obey the law of God for himself; for every creature, however high in the scale of being, is bound to serve God with all his mind and heart on his own account. Had he been a sinful man, like all mere men, his life would have been forfeited by transgression, and therefore not at his own disposal. But the Saviour being neither a mere man nor a sinful man, but the Son of God in a holy human nature, could not owe obedience unto death to God for himself personally; for being God, he was necessarily not subject to the law, and possessing a holy human nature unconnected with Adam by natural descent, he was not liable unto death. The life which he had as Immanuel was therefore of such a nature as no created being in the universe ever possessed. It was his own and entirely at his own disposal. 'I,' says he, 'lay down my life for the sheep. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father.' (John x. 15, 18.) It is plain, from these words, that the Saviour had power over his life, and that he voluntarily laid it down for the sheep, in obedience to the commandment of his Father. If, then, the Saviour, as Immanuel, God with us, was under no obligation either to obey or suffer on his own account, it follows, from the very constitution of his mediatorial character, that all his obedience and sufferings must have been for others,

and, consequently, that in laying down his life he acted in the character of a representative.

2. That Christ Jesus, in giving obedience unto death, acted in the character of a representative, is evident from the analogy that exists between him and Adam in Paradise. Adam under the Edenic dispensation was appointed to act as the moral head or representative of the human race. We shall not detain the reader by a statement of the evidence of the truth of this doctrine, as we have stated it elsewhere. (Edenic Dispensation, p. 35.) But taking it as granted, we observe that if Christ were likened to Adam in this respect, then he must sustain and act in a representative character, under the mediatorial dispensation. The apostle Paul, however, explicitly declares that an analogy exists between Adam and Christ: 'Adam,' says he, 'is the figure (or type) of him that was to come.' (Rom. v. 14.) As there is invariably a resemblance between the type and the antitype, so, according to this passage, there must be a resemblance between Adam and Christ. Now, the question is, wherein does this resemblance consist? This resemblance is not to be found in their persons; for Adam is a mere man, whereas Christ is both God and man, in two distinct natures, and one person for ever. Nor is it to be found in the nature of the acts which they severally performed; for, as the context shows, Adam sinned, whereas Christ perfectly obeyed the law of God. Nor is it to be found in the conse-

quences of their acts; for the condemnation of 'the many' is the effect of Adam's disobedience, and the justification unto life of 'the many' is the effect of Christ's obedience. But this resemblance is found in the official relation which each sustained to 'the many' as their representative. If it were otherwise, how could Adam have been the type of him that was to come, and how could we account for the statement of facts which the apostle makes when he says, ver. 18, 'Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life'? If Adam did not represent and act for all men under the law of works, how could they be placed under a sentence of condemnation on account of his sin? And in like manner, if Christ did not represent and act for all those who shall receive the justification of life, how could they receive that gift on account of his righteousness?

This argument in proof of the representative character of Christ from the analogy which exists between him and Adam, is further confirmed by the words of the apostle when he says, '*The first man* Adam was made a living soul, *the last Adam* was made a quickening spirit. *The first man* is of the earth, earthy; *the second man* is the Lord from heaven.' (1 Cor. xv. 45, 47.) Deny the representative character of Christ, and on what principle could he be called the last Adam and the second man? He cannot be

likened unto Adam in regard to his nature and personality; for in this respect he is contrasted with him: 'The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven.' Nor can he be called the second man in regard to the numerical order of the race, for Cain is so literally. But admit the truth of his representative character, and do we not at once perceive that there is a resemblance between him and Adam, and that this analogy constitutes a satisfactory reason why he should be called the last Adam and the second man? 'Both are federal heads of distinct bodies of men, whose moral condition and destinies are dependent on, and affected by, their conduct respectively.' If each sustains a representative character, in the dispensation of which he is the moral head, the comparison between them is apt and instructive; but if it were otherwise, it is inept, unmeaning, and inconsistent with truth. Since then Adam in Paradise sustained a representative character, and since the scriptures affirm that there is an analogy between him and our Lord Jesus Christ in this respect, we conclude that Christ, in giving obedience unto death for the salvation of sinners, acted also in the character of a representative.

3. That Christ Jesus, in yielding obedience unto death, acted in the character of a representative, is evident from the consideration that his righteousness could not otherwise be imputable to sinners.

It is evident, from the dictates of reason and of

revelation, that no sinner can be justified before God on the ground of his own righteousness: 'All the world are become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin.' It is equally plain that all who are saved are justified exclusively on the ground of Christ's righteousness, or of what he did and suffered for their redemption: 'Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.' Now, how does Christ's righteousness become ours, so that we may obtain the justification of life? The scriptures teach us that the righteousness of Christ becomes ours in consequence of the gracious acts of God in imputing it to us, or in placing it to our account, and in uniting us to him by faith. (Rom. iv. 23, 24.) No deeds, however, can be righteously imputed to men except such as belong to them, and are truly their deeds. It would be inconsistent with truth, if God were to impute that to sinners which did not belong to them —to count that ours which is not so in reality. But, as we have elsewhere shown, 'there are only two classes of deeds that belong to us, and that can be properly called our deeds. *First*, Those deeds which we actually perform by our personal agency. *Secondly*, Those deeds which we legally perform by the agency of a representative. Both these kinds of deeds are imputable to men, because they are their deeds; but no other deeds can be imputed to them, because no

other deeds except those which belong to one or other of these classes can be considered legally as their deeds.' (Edenic Dispensation, p. 260.) Now, the deeds which the Saviour performed for our redemption obviously cannot be imputed to us on the principle that they were done by us personally. These, therefore, can only be imputed to us on the principle that He in performing them acted not for himself, but in our name and for our interests; or, in other words, as our representative. Deny the representative character of Christ, and you destroy the very foundation on which the imputation of his righteousness to sinners for the justification of life rests, and consequently all their hopes of 'being found in him, not having their own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith.' Deny this, and how could they be benefited by his obedience unto death more than by that of his martyred saints? Deny this, and you impiously set aside the propitiatory character of his work, and restrict its influence to that of mere example. From the consideration, therefore, that the righteousness of Christ could not be imputed to sinners as the ground of their justification to life, unless in giving obedience unto death he had acted as their representative, we conclude that the Saviour actually sustained this character in the economy of redemption.

4. That Christ Jesus, in giving obedience unto

death, acted in the character of a representative, is evident from the consideration that he is expressly called *a surety* in the sacred scriptures.

In the epistle to the Hebrews it is said, 'Jesus was made a surety of a better covenant.' (Heb. vii. 22.) The word ἔγγυος literally signifies a surety or bondsman. It denotes the person who, in regard either to a contract or debt, becomes security for another, and who engages to fulfil the contract and to pay the debt, if the principal should be either unable or fail to do so himself. If Christ, then, is called a surety, does not this title clearly teach us that he must have acted, in giving obedience unto death, not for himself, but for others? For whom then did he act as a surety? He could not, as some have alleged, be a surety for the Father to secure the fulfilment of his promises; for it is not possible that the faithful Jehovah can falsify his promises. But, like the high priest under the law, he was a surety for the people to God. 'A surety for a bankrupt—for this is the only comparison which the present case will admit—is one who engages to satisfy his creditors by paying his debts; hence, when Jesus Christ is called the surety of the new covenant, the meaning evidently is, that he undertook to discharge the debt which sinners owed to the law and justice of God—the debt of obedience and the debt of suffering. The character of a surety, which is given to our Saviour in scripture, points him out as the representative of others, and as having come under an engage-

ment to fulfil certain terms in their name and for their benefit.' (Dr Dick's Lectures on Theology, Lect. 48.) Since, then, the Lord Jesus Christ, as a surety, acted not for himself, but in the name and for the benefit of sinners; it follows that he sustains a representative character in the economy of redemption.

These arguments clearly prove that the Saviour, in giving obedience unto death, acted in the character of a representative; and if so, it follows, we apprehend, that in performing this work, he must have represented persons, and not things, as some have alleged. A representative is a relative term, and suggests the correlative idea of *the represented;* those, therefore, for whom he died must be persons and not things; they must be human beings; for, in strict propriety of language, it is only persons that can be legally and morally represented. As, however, some theologians entertain the opinion that the Saviour died not for sinners personally, but merely for sin, we shall endeavour, ere we proceed to the next observation, to expose the fallacy of this sentiment.

'Strictly speaking,' says Dr Payne, 'the atonement was not made for one man or for all men; it was made to God for sin, *i.e.* on account of sin.' (Dr Payne's Lectures on Divine Sovereignty, 1st ed., p. 213.) According to this statement, as we understand it, Christ did not die for sinners personally, but for sin in the abstract. Now we regard this doctrine as unscriptural, on the following grounds: 1st, Because

if it were true, then the contrary doctrine, namely, that Christ sustains a representative character in the economy of redemption, must necessarily be false. If the atonement was not made for one man or for all men, then it is plain that Christ, in dying, did not represent any of the human race whatsoever. 2d, Because the scriptures teach us, that the typical high priests under the law made atonement for sinners personally: 'There shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation when the high priest goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place, until he come out, and have made an atonement *for himself, and for his household, and for all the congregation of Israel.*' (Lev. xvi. 17.) It is evident from this text that the typical atonement was not made for sin in general, but for sinners personally. Aaron was to make atonement *for himself and for the people*, (ver. 24.) 3d, Because the scriptures teach us that the great antitypical High Priest died not for sin, but for sinners personally. There is an analogy between the typical atonements under the law, and that which is antitypical. As the Jewish high priests made atonement for the people, so the Saviour made atonement, not for sin in general, but for sinners in particular. 'God,' says the apostle Paul, 'commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died *for* us,' (ὑπὲρ ἡμων) instead of us. (Compare with Matt. v. 38.) 'The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for

(ὑπὲρ instead of) many.' 'This is my body broken for (ὑπὲρ instead of) you.' 'Christ has once suffered for sins, the just for (ὑπὲρ instead of) the unjust, that he might bring us to God.' When it is said, as in the last text, that Christ suffered for (περὶ on account of) sins, this, and similar phraseology throughout the scriptures, never means that he suffered the punishment of sin in the abstract, but invariably that he suffered the punishment due to the unjust on account of their transgressions. And lastly, because sin in the abstract is an absurdity, and cannot, from its very nature, be punished. Sin always and necessarily has a relation to the person who commits it. We cannot conceive of it without the correlative idea of a sinner. What is sin in the abstract? It is a quality of the actions of moral agents. Apart from such agents it has, and can have, no existence. Sin being the quality of an action, cannot, therefore, in the very nature of things, be punished. It is the sinner only who can be punished for his sins. It is impossible that the magistrate can punish the crimes of theft and robbery, or any other crimes of his subjects, he can only punish the persons who committed them. In like manner, the moral Governor of the universe does not punish sin, for sin abstractly being a nonentity cannot be punished; but he punishes sinners in their persons for their iniquities. Now if we apply this principle to the subject in question, we are shut up to the conclusion, that God did not punish sin in Christ, but that he inflicted punish-

ment on him as standing by federal representation in the place of transgressors. And is not the truth of this conclusion established by the word of God, when he says, 'Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts, smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered, and I will turn mine hand upon the little ones?' It was not sin that was smitten, (as the theory of Dr Payne requires,) but the man Jehovah's fellow, and our Shepherd.

Assuming it then as proven that the Saviour did not become obedient unto death for sin in the abstract, but as the representative of sinners personally, it remains to be considered,

Secondly, Whether did the Lord Jesus Christ, in giving obedience unto death, act as the representative of all sinners, or of some sinners of the human race? Or whether is he the representative of those who shall perish in their sins as truly as of those who shall be saved?

Now, this question can only be determined by the character of those arrangements which the persons of the Godhead made between themselves in eternity, with a view to the accomplishment of the purpose of mercy. The extent of the representative relation depends in every case on the will of the parties who form it. For example, the extent of the constituency who are appointed to choose persons to act as their representatives in Parliament, is determined by the

will of the legislative powers of the nation. If this then is so, whether is it the will of the three persons of the Godhead that the Son of God should act as the representative of all men, or of a peculiar people? This question, again, may be determined by attention to the extent of those consequences which result to men from the works which he performed in his representative character. The results of his works distinctly indicate what were the intentions of Deity, both in the appointment and performance of them. If Christ were the representative of all men, then should not all men be equally benefited by the works which he performed in their name and for their interests? We argue, and do we not argue justly, that if all men were made sinners, and if all die in consequence of Adam's sin in eating the forbidden fruit, then Adam must have been the representative of the whole human race under the Edenic dispensation? But there is an analogy between Adam and Christ. Both were representative characters; and, therefore, if we attend to the consequences of Christ's obedience, we shall in like manner ascertain the extent of his federal representation, just as we ascertain the extent of Adam's representation by the universality of the results of his disobedience. 'By the offence of one,' says an apostle, 'judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's dis-

obedience many were made sinners; so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.' (Rom. v. 18, 19.) Now, if Christ were the representative of all men, is it not reasonable to conclude from this passage that all men should obtain the justification of life, and be made righteous in consequence of his obedience, just as all men were made sinners and die in consequence of the disobedience of the first man? If the representation in both cases were co-extensive, then certainly the consequences of Christ's obedience, namely, righteousness and life, should have been as universal as the consequences of Adam's disobedience, namely, sin and death. According to this theory, therefore, all men, without exception, shall be saved. Such a conclusion, however, is inconsistent with facts that cannot be called in question. Do not history, and observation, and the Bible unite in teaching us that there are multitudes in every age and place of the world who live and die in their sins? And does not the word of God further assure us, that many of our race shall at last be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power, when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe? From the fact, then, that righteousness and life are not enjoyed by men universally, are we not, reasoning from analogy, warranted to conclude, that it was not the will of the three persons of the Godhead that the Saviour, like Adam, should repre

sent all mankind, and act in their name and for their interests; but that, on the contrary, he should represent a definite portion of their number—even all who come to him by faith, and who shall eventually be saved?

As the question respecting the extent of Christ's representation is of great importance in theology, and as some deny the truth of the above conclusion, we shall here endeavour to set before the mind of the reader further proof of the doctrine, *That our Lord Jesus Christ, in giving obedience unto death, acted as the representative, not of all men without exception, but of a definite portion of the human family*, and we observe,

1. That Christ is the representative not of all men, but of a definite number of our race, is evident from the analogy which exists between his official character and that of the Jewish high priests.

The high priest under the law acted in the ministrations of his office not in a private, but in a public character—as the representative of the Israelites. The truth of this statement is abundantly evident, *first*, from the command which God gave to Moses respecting the ephod. 'Thou,' says he, 'shalt take two onyx-stones, and grave on them the names of the children of Israel: six of their names on one stone, and the other six names of the rest on the other stone, according to their birth. With the work of an engraver in stone, like the engravings of a signet, shalt

thou engrave the two stones with the names of the children of Israel: thou shalt make them to be set in ouches of gold. And thou shalt put the two stones upon the shoulders of the ephod, for stones of memorial unto the children of Israel: and Aaron shall bear their names before the Lord, upon his two shoulders, for a memorial.' (Exod. xxviii. 9–12.) And *secondly*, from the command which God gave to him also respecting the breastplate of judgment. 'Thou,' says he, 'shalt make the breastplate of judgment with cunning work. . . . And thou shalt set in it settings of stones, even four rows of stones. . . . And the stones shall be with the names of the children of Israel, twelve, according to their names, like the engravings of a signet, every one with his name shall they be according to the twelve tribes. And Aaron shall bear the names of the children of Israel in the breastplate of judgment upon his heart, when he goeth in unto the holy place, for a memorial before the Lord continually.' (Exod. xxviii. 15, 17, 21, 29.) These passages, as the attentive reader will at once perceive, do not merely teach us that the Jewish high priest sustained a representative character, but they also define the extent of his representation. He did not represent the nations of the Gentiles, but the church of Israel. The names that were graven on the onyx-stones upon the shoulders of the ephod, and on the precious stones on the breastplate of judgment, were the names of the twelve tribes of Israel. The extent

of his representation was determined by the covenant which created it, and with which all his ministrations were connected, namely, the covenant which God made with the Israelites at the foot of Mount Sinai—(Exod. xxiv. 3-8)—and that as a renewal and more extended revelation of the covenant he had made with their father Abraham in the land of Canaan. (Gen. xvii. 7.) Hence we find that on the great day of atonement, when the high priest 'killed the goat of the sin-offering, it was for the people.' (Lev. xvi. 15.) And also, that when 'he laid both his hands upon the head of the live goat, he confessed over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat; for on that day,' God says, 'shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord.' (Lev. xvi. 21, 30.) It is plain from these texts that the beneficial effects of the typical atonements of the law, which, an apostle tells us, 'sanctified to the purifying of the flesh,' were restricted to the Israelites or to such of the Gentiles as had become proselytes to their religion. Now, if the Jewish high priest was a typical character, and if he acted in his official ministrations as the representative of the seed of Abraham according to the flesh, or for the members of the Jewish church according to the covenant which God had made with them, are we not warranted to conclude that Christ, who is the anti-typical high

priest of the covenant, sustains also a representative character, and that the extent of his representation is determined by the covenant of grace, and embraces those only 'who are Abraham's seed according to the promise?' If these doctrines were denied, where, we ask, is the resemblance between the type and the antitype? and how could an apostle affirm that 'Christ is an high priest over the house of God, and that he was faithful as a son over his own house, whose house are we if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end'? (Heb. x. 21; iii. 6.)

2. That Christ is the representative, not of all men, but of a definite number of our race, is evident from the character of those relations which he sustains to them in accomplishing the work of redemption. If Christ were the representative of all men; if, in becoming obedient unto death, he died equally for Judas as for John the beloved disciple, then it follows that the relations which he sustained to men in this work must be general and common to all. To say that he died equally or in every sense for all, and that at the same time he sustained in his death peculiar relations to some, would evidently be to affirm contradictory propositions. The scriptures, however, plainly teach us that Christ in dying sustained special relations to a certain number of the human family. In these he is called their Saviour and Redeemer—their Shepherd—their Head—their Husband—the Surety of the Covenant—and their Forerunner.

Christ in the scriptures is frequently called the Saviour and Redeemer of Israel. Now, these are relative names, and evidently involve the correlative ideas of the saved and the redeemed. Can there be a Saviour who does not save, a Redeemer who does not redeem? If Christ's name then is the Redeemer, or Jesus the Saviour, and if he does not actually save all men, but only, as the angel declared to Joseph, 'His people from their sins,' are we not warranted to conclude that he sustained a peculiar relation to his people, or, in other words, that he is the representative of a definite number of the human race?

Jesus Christ is also called in the scripture the shepherd of the sheep. 'I am,' says he, 'the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.' (John x. 11.) Those whom Christ calls his sheep are not all men universally, but a definite portion of their number. This is evident from the description that he gives of them as persons whom the Father gave him (ver. 29)—whom he knows with a discriminating and an approving knowledge (ver. 14)—who hear his voice—who know and follow him (ver. 14, 27)—to whom he gives eternal life, who shall never perish, nor be plucked by any enemy either out of his hand or out of his Father's hand (ver. 28, 29)—and whom he calls his sheep in contradistinction to those whom he elsewhere calls the goats (Matt. xxv. 25, 32, 33.) Now, does not this description which Christ gives us of his sheep prove, beyond

a doubt, that there is a certain and definite number of our race, to whom he sustains the relation of a shepherd, whom he loves with a special affection, and for whose salvation he laid down his life, or, in other words, for whom, in giving obedience unto death, he acted as a representative?

This conclusion cannot be set aside, as Dr Jenkyn and others attempt to do, by the statement 'that the scriptures do not mark these as the only characters for whom the Son of God died.' This is a mere evasion of the argument. The question here is not, Does Christ in some sense sustain a general or common relation to all men, or did he die in some sense for the benefit of the race? These things we do not deny. But the question is, Does Christ sustain a specific and peculiar relation to the sheep, or did he die in a special manner for their salvation? The theory of our opponents requires them to maintain that Christ, as a Saviour, is equally related to the goats who perish as to the sheep to whom he gives eternal life. We submit to the candid inquirer, whether this view of the subject is not plainly at variance with the character of Christ as the good shepherd of the sheep, and with his declared intention of laying down his life *for their salvation?* Nor can the above conclusion be set aside by the allegation, that sinners are not in any sense the sheep of Christ until they come to him and embrace him by faith as their shepherd: for he calls

those sinners of the Gentiles whom he was to save his sheep, before he had either laid down his life for them or favoured them with the means of salvation: 'Other sheep I have,' he says, 'which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd,' (ver. 16.)

Further, Christ is called in the scriptures the head of the church: 'He is,' says the apostle Paul, 'the head of the body, the church.' (Col. i. 18.) 'Christ is the head of the church; and he is the saviour of the body.' (Eph. v. 23.) 'As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.' (1 Cor. xii. 12, 27.) It is clear from these, and similar texts of scripture, that the Lord Jesus Christ is head of the church—that the church is his mystical body—that this body consists of all those who in every age of the world are united to him by faith—that the members of the church sustain a relation to Christ analogous to that which the members of the natural body do to the head—that this relation is intimate and peculiar, and such as he does not sustain to the world, being not merely their head of government, but of vital and saving influence—and that Christ, as the head of his body, the church, loves all the members of it with a discriminating and special affection, and regards any injury

or act of kindness done to them as done to himself. (Acts ix. 5; Matt. xxv. 40.) Now, if Christ is thus the head of the church—if he sustains a peculiar relation to the church as her head, loving and caring for her members, as members of his mystical body, with a special affection—and if, as will not be denied, this relationship is not of a natural, but of a gracious character,—is it not evident that he acts, in accomplishing the work of redemption, as the federal head and representative of a definite number of mankind? The doctrine that Christ is equally the head and representative of the entire race, is plainly inconsistent with the above passages of scripture, and with that speciality of relationship which he sustains to his body, the church, as its life-giving head.

Further, the Lord Jesus Christ is called in the scriptures the Husband of the church, and she is called the Lamb's wife. (Is. liv. 5; Rev. xix. 7.) The character of this relationship between Christ and his church is very fully described in Eph. v. 22–33. This passage distinctly teaches us, that there is an analogy between the union of Christ to the church and the conjugal relationship. As the husband is joined unto his wife, and they two are one flesh, so the church is united to Christ by a marriage covenant, for, says Paul, 'we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones' (ver. 30, 31);—that the love which Christ entertains to the church is not of a general but of a special character, and analogous to the

conjugal affection. As a dutiful husband loves his wife with a particular love, such as he bears to no other woman, so in like manner Christ loves his church with a particular love, such as he does not entertain to the world: 'Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church' (ver. 25, 33);—and that it was under the influence of this discriminating and special love to the church that Christ 'gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it, and present it at last to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy, and without blemish' (ver. 25–27.) Now if, according to this passage, the Saviour is related to the church by a marriage covenant, and if he gave himself for her in the exercise of such a special love as is analogous to the special affection which a dutiful husband cherishes to his wife; we put it to our opponents if it is not manifestly inconsistent with these statements to assert that he loves all men alike, and that he died equally, or in every sense, for all. If Christ then, in becoming obedient unto death, had a discriminating and special love to a definite number of the human race, even to the church which he purchased with his own blood, are we not shut up to the conclusion, that he acted, in laying down his life, not as the representative of all men, but of this peculiar people?

We might further have proved from the union which the Saviour sustains to his people, not simply

as a surety, but as the surety *of the covenant*, and as the forerunner who has entered for them within the vail, that these relations also are of a special character, and do not embrace all mankind, and, consequently, that Christ cannot, in consistency with these relations, be viewed as the representative of all men, but only of such as he will eventually bring to glory, and of whom he will at last say, 'Behold I and the children which God hath given me.' But as we conceive enough has been already stated to establish the truth of this doctrine, we proceed to observe,

3. That Christ is the representative, not of all men, but of a definite number of our race, is evident from the discriminative names and titles which are given to them in the holy scriptures. Christians are there called 'the seed of the woman,' in contradistinction from 'the seed of the serpent;' 'Christ's seed, Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ,' in contradistinction from those who are not Christ's, and strangers from the covenants of promise; 'God's elect,' in contradistinction from the non-elect; 'Christ's sheep,' in contradistinction from the goats; and 'God's people and God's beloved,' in contradistinction from those who are not his people and not beloved. Now, do not these and similar discriminative names which are given to christians in the book of God, plainly teach us that a number of our race sustain peculiar relations to the Saviour, and such as are not common to all

men, and consequently establish the conclusion, that he acted in accomplishing the work of redemption as their federal representative?

On the whole, the reader will bear in mind, that the design of this induction of particulars, in proof that the Son of God acts in the economy of redemption—*first*, as the Father's servant, and, *secondly*, as the representative of a peculiar people—was to show that the purpose of mercy is accomplished by means of the formation or assumption of new relations between the three persons of the Godhead themselves, and between them and fallen man. In prosecuting this design we have adopted the *a posteriori* mode of argument, because it appears to us that we can better ascertain the new and gracious relations which the three persons of the Godhead formed between themselves, and between them and fallen man, by attending to these relations as manifested in the distinct characters which they sustain, and in the distinct works which they severally perform in accomplishing the purpose of mercy, than by the consideration of that purpose itself abstractly. When we find, in general, that the three persons of the Godhead sustain distinct characters, and perform distinct works, in the redemption of the church, and in particular, that the Father acts as the representative of Deity; that the Son, as mediator, sustains and acts in a twofold character, namely, as the Father's servant, and as the representative of a peculiar people; and that the Holy Ghost acts as the

Spirit of the Father and of Christ; we seem justly warranted to conclude, that their economical characters and works are the result of new relations formed in the council of peace between themselves, and between them and fallen man; and, consequently, that the formation of these new and gracious relations constitutes one of the means by which the purpose of mercy was to be accomplished.

SECT. II.—*The purpose of mercy is accomplished by means of the covenant transactions between the Father, as sustaining the majesty and rights of Deity, and the Son, as constituted the Father's servant and our representative.*

The scriptures teach us, that certain important transactions took place in eternity between the Father as the representative of Deity, and the Son as his servant, and as the representative of his people. These transactions between the Father and Son, which are commonly called the covenant of grace, consist in those *promises* and *commands* which the Father gave to the Son as mediator, and which the Son received and engaged to obey. Before, however, we proceed to the consideration of these promises and commands, we beg to call the attention of the reader to the distinction that exists between the character of Christ as the Father's servant, and as the representative of a peculiar people.

It will not be denied that there is a distinction between the relations and works of Christ as a servant, and his relations and works as the surety of the covenant or representative of his people. Would not the denial of this be as absurd as a denial of the existence of any distinction between his relations and works as the anointed prophet, priest, and king of the church? If, then, the names of Christ, the Father's servant and the surety of the covenant, are to be understood, not as a revelation of him in the same, but in different aspects of his character and work, wherein does this distinction consist? In reply to this question, we submit to the reader the following statements:—

The character of Christ as the Father's servant, is expressive of the relation which he sustains to God; but his character as a representative is expressive of the relation which he sustains to his people. The work he performs as the Father's servant he does in the name of God, and for God on behalf of men generally. The work he performs as a representative he does to God in the name of his people, and for their salvation. In his character as the Father's servant, he sustains the offices of a prophet, priest, and king, and performs the whole of his mediatorial work; but in his character as the representative of a peculiar people, he sustains merely the office of a priest—giving himself for them to redeem them from all iniquity, and interceding for the Holy Spirit to make his revelations as a prophet effectual for their

salvation, and to incline their hearts to keep his laws as a king. The work he performs as the Father's servant is co-extensive with his mediation. It affects, in one form or other, all intelligent beings, and has a common relation to the human race—to those who shall be lost, as truly as to those who shall be saved. Everything that he, as mediator, has done, is doing, or shall do, either to God, or to angels, whether good or evil, or to the saved and lost of mankind, is included in the commission he received from the Father, and done by him as a servant in the execution of that commission, and for the accomplishment of all the ends of the mediatorial dispensation. But the work which the Son of God performs as the representative of his people is not so extensive. It has a special relation to elect infants, and to those 'who shall believe on him through his word,' and includes only those works which he performs in their name, and with the design of securing their eternal salvation. The work he does, as a representative, is peculiar to those who are saved; whereas the work he does, as the Father's servant, has a common relation to the whole family of man—to those who shall perish, as truly as to those who shall be saved; and it places all men, as sinners and subjects of Jehovah, under the mediatorial form of government, and in a position in which they may obtain salvation through faith in Christ Jesus.

Though, however, in accomplishing these objects,

the Saviour acts only as the Father's servant, yet, in giving his life with the intention of saving his people from their sins, he does not act merely as their representative, but acts, at the same time, as the Father's servant; for he sustains the relation of a servant to the Father in performing the whole of his mediatorial work. It is, for example, both as the Father's servant and as a representative, that the Saviour makes atonement for his people by intercession, founded on his obedience unto death, as the condition of the covenant of grace; but it is simply as the Father's servant that he has revealed the will of God, and given the sacred scriptures to the world as a means of salvation—that he has instituted all the ordinances of religion—that he promulgates the mediatorial law amongst mankind as the rule of their faith and practice—that he enforces obedience to this law by the most solemn sanctions—that he conducts the administration of providence in the present life—and that he shall eventually bring it to a termination by the judgment of the last day. It is both as the Father's servant and as a representative that the Saviour 'gave himself for his people, that he might redeem them from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works;' but it is simply as the Father's servant that he established the mediatorial dispensation, as a system of moral government, immediately after the fall of Adam, and that he rules over the race in all ages by means of its

revelations and laws.—In a word, the work of Christ as a servant was performed in the name of the Father, removed those legal obstacles which the sin of Adam had interposed between man and salvation, and rendered it consistent with the purity of the divine nature, and the principles of equity, in the Father to command all men to believe on Christ, and to promise salvation to every one who believes; or in other words, to establish the mediatorial form of government among men. Whereas the work of Christ as the representative of those who were given him of the Father, in the transactions of the everlasting covenant, was performed in their name, and infallibly secured to them the gift and enjoyment of eternal life. In the former case his work has chiefly a relation to the character and law of God, as a moral Governor; while in the latter it has chiefly a relation to his character and promise of mercy, as a Sovereign Benefactor. Keeping then this distinction in view, we observe—

1. That the Father in the covenant of grace gave a *promise* to the Son, *as his servant*, to place the whole human race as fallen in Adam, and all things beside, under his mediatorial government.

We have already shown that one design of God, in the purpose of mercy in regard to sinners of the human family, was to establish and promulgate the mediatorial form of moral government or law, as the rule by which their conduct ought to be regulated. Now, as a means to the accomplishment of this end, the

Father *first* delivered into the hand of the Son, as his servant, the whole race of man, that he might rule over them. 'Thou,' says Christ to the Father, 'hast given thy Son power over all flesh.' And again, 'All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.' And says Paul, 'The head of every man is Christ.' (1 Cor. xi. 3.) These texts distinctly teach us, that the Father has made a grant of mankind to Christ, and constituted him their head of government. And if so, it follows that the race are not now immediately under the dominion of God in his absolute character, as Adam and Eve were in their primeval state, and in Paradise; but mediately as put under the government of the Mediator. Hence it is affirmed in holy writ, that men 'are not without law to God, but under the law to Christ'—that Christ is King of kings, and Lord of lords—and that it is the duty of the judges of the earth, and of all men, to submit themselves to his delegated authority. 'Kiss the Son,' says the Father, 'lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him.' As a means of accomplishing this end, the Father, *secondly*, put all things that are in heaven, and that are in earth, under the dominion of the Son as mediator. Hence says Christ, 'The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand.' And hence also says an apostle, 'He is the head of all principality and power;' and again, 'Thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and

didst set him over the work of thy hands. Thou hast put all things under his feet.'

This grant, made by the Father to the Son, of authority over all flesh, and over all the other works of his hand, is obviously of a federal character. It was an honour which the Father promised to confer on the Son as his servant, as well as a means of fulfilling the ends of his mediatorial work. 'Unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.' It was part of the reward promised him in the covenant, and on the enjoyment of which, in the human nature, he entered after his resurrection. 'His sitting down at the right hand of the throne of God, was the joy,' an apostle tells us, 'that was set before him, and for which he endured the cross and despised its shame.'

2. The Father, in the covenant of grace, gave to the Son, *in his representative character*, a definite number of the human race, and a promise to bestow on them eternal life.

We have formerly shown that a second great design of God in the purpose of mercy in regard to man, was to save a definite number of the race from sin and misery, and to bring them to glory. In executing this design, we find, *first*, that in eternity the Father gave to the Son, and that the Son accepted, a certain

number of our fallen family as his peculiar inheritance. In proof of this we appeal to the following texts of scripture: 'I pray,' says Christ, 'not for the world, *but for them which thou hast given me;* for they are thine. And all mine are thine, and thine are mine; and I am glorified in them.' (John xvii. 9, 10.) This prayer of Christ though restricted to a portion of those who were given to him of the Father, even to those who were then his disciples, yet is afterwards extended so as to embrace all those in every age and place of the world who in like manner were given to him, and would in due time become his disciples. 'Neither pray I,' says he, 'for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word.' (Ver. 20.) Again he says, 'Thou hast given me power over all flesh, that I should give eternal life *to as many as thou hast given me.*' '*All that the Father giveth me* shall come to me, and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.' 'Behold I and *the children which God hath given me.*' 'Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom *prepared for you from the foundation of the world.*' It is plain from these texts that a certain number of the human family were in eternity given by the Father to the Son, and that he accepted of these as his peculiar possession.

In executing this design, we find, *secondly*, that the Father gave a *promise* to the Son, that he would save all those whom he had given to him, and eventually

bring them to glory. In proof of this we appeal to the word of God by the Psalmist: 'I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant, Thy seed will I establish for ever, and build up thy throne to all generations. His seed also will I make to endure for ever, and his throne as the days of heaven. If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments; if they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments; then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless my loving-kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail. My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips.' (Ps. lxxxix. 3, 4, 29–34.) In these and other parts of this psalm the Father promises the Son, in regard to *the seed* he had given him, that he would establish it for ever—that he would make it to endure for ever—and that, though he might visit their transgression with chastisements, yet he would not take his love from them nor suffer his faithfulness to fail. Now do not these promises plainly teach us, that the Father will give eternal life by Christ, not to all men, but to a definite portion of their number—even to those who are called the antitypical David's seed? We are aware that some commentators restrict this psalm and these promises to the covenant of royalty which God established with David and his descendants. No doubt its primary reference is to that covenant. But the transactions recorded in the

psalm are too grand and heavenly, and the predicted results of them are too glorious and enduring, to be limited to the house of David and kingdom of Israel. A greater than David is here. Deny that the covenant transactions of God with David recorded in this psalm are emblematical illustrations of the covenant transactions that took place in eternity between the Father and the Son; deny that the regal office established in David's house was designed to typify the kingly office of Christ; and would you not thereby flatly subvert the doctrine which the angel Gabriel teaches us, when in announcing the birth of Messiah he said to Mary, 'Thou shalt call his name Jesus; He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end'? Do not these words plainly teach us that the kingly office established in David's house was of a typical nature, and that the type received its accomplishment in the royalty and dominion of him who is David's Son and David's Lord?

Further, in proof that the Father gave a promise to the Son to save all those he had given to him, we appeal to the word of God by the prophet Isaiah, Isa. liii. 10–12. We shall quote it in the translation by Bishop Lowth: 'If his soul shall make a propitiatory sacrifice, he shall see a seed which shall prolong their days, and the gracious purpose of Jehovah shall

prosper in his hands. Of the travail of his soul he shall see (the fruit) and be satisfied: by the knowledge of him shall my servant justify many; for the punishment of their iniquities he shall bear. Therefore will I distribute to him the many for his portion,' etc. Now this passage, whether we attend to it as translated in the authorised version or by Dr Lowth, plainly teaches us, that the Father gave promises to the Son, that he should see a spiritual seed which shall prolong their days—that he should see the fruit of the travail of his soul and be satisfied—and that he should justify many, even the many who were given to him for his portion. No man can consistently believe these things, and deny that the Father gave the Son a definite number of the human race, and the promise to bestow on these eternal life.

In proof of the truth of this doctrine, we finally appeal to the words of the apostle Paul to Titus: 'In hope of eternal life,' says he, 'which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began.' (Titus i. 2.) In this verse it is affirmed that the Father promised eternal life before the world began to those who, in the preceding verse, are called 'God's elect.' Now a promise always supposes a person to whom it is made. If God then promised eternal life to his people before the world began, it is evident that this promise could not be made to themselves personally, as they were not then in existence, and consequently that it must have

been given to Christ as their federal head or representative.

On the whole, we submit to the reader whether these passages of scripture to which we have appealed, do not fully establish the truth of the doctrine, that the Father, in the covenant of grace, gave to the Son, as mediator, a definite number of the human family, and *a promise* to bestow on them eternal life.

3. In the covenant of grace the Father prescribed to the Son, as his servant, and as the representative of his people, *the condition* on which the promises given to him should be accomplished, and the Son engaged to perform the stipulated condition of their fulfilment.

The condition of the covenant of grace consists in two things: in perfect obedience to the law of God, and in the suffering of death as the penalty incurred by the transgression of it. These two things the apostle Paul sums up in one phrase, obedience unto (μέχρι until) death.

First, The condition of the covenant of grace consists in perfect obedience to the law of God. This is evident from the nature of things, and the circumstances of the case. The act of God in justification is to pronounce a person righteous in his sight, or to declare that his conduct is in perfect conformity to the law of his moral government. Righteousness or perfect obedience to the law of God is the only ground on which either holy beings in a state of probation, or

sinful beings in a state of depravity and condemnation, can be justified by their divine Lawgiver and Judge. As perfect obedience was the condition on which eternal life was promised to Adam and the race under the Edenic dispensation, so it is still the condition on which the justification of life is to be obtained under the mediatorial economy. The transgression of Adam did not, and could not, repeal the moral law—the law of his primeval state, which was embodied in the positive precept of Eden. That law originates in the nature of God, and is founded on those relations he sustains to men as their Creator and Lawgiver, and which men sustain to him as his creatures and the subjects of his moral government. It can never, therefore, be set aside or relaxed in its obligations in accommodation to the sinfulness and imperfections of their fallen condition, but must still demand that perfect obedience which Adam failed to yield to its precepts as their representative. Now, if the moral law is thus obligatory on man, and still demands perfect obedience, and if righteousness is the only ground on which sinners can be justified, it is evident, from the very nature of things, that it must be in vain for any of our race to expect the Lawgiver to pronounce him righteous in his sight, and award him the justification of life, unless all his thoughts, and desires, and actions were in perfect conformity with its precepts, and unless he were still under a covenant of works. As, however, man is now in a state of sinfulness, and

under the curse, and as all sin and come short of the glory of God, it is consequently utterly impossible that any can obtain this blessing on the ground of personal obedience to the law of God. 'By the deeds of the law,' says an apostle, 'there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin.' If, therefore, perfect obedience to the law is the only ground on which God can pronounce a moral agent righteous in his sight, and if men as sinful beings are morally unable to yield this obedience, it follows that none of our race could be saved unless a righteousness were wrought out for them by one who was able to keep the law perfectly—who was not under law to God on his own account—and who was so related to them as that his obedience should be federally their obedience, and consequently imputable to them in itself and in its saving effects. The claims of the law cannot be destroyed. On the contrary, these must be fulfilled, magnified, and made honourable by the obedience of the Surety which the Lawgiver has appointed to act in their name and for their interests. If any sinner is to obtain the justification of life, it must be not merely by grace, but in perfect consistency with those immutable principles of equity on which the moral government of God is founded and administered. Hence we find that the Father, in the arrangements of the covenant of grace, requires the Son, as his servant and as the representative of his people, to give perfect obedience to the law which

man had violated, and that as the condition on which he promised and would dispense to them the justification of life.

In proof of the truth of this doctrine, we appeal to the words of the apostle Paul, in which it is affirmed, that the Son of God, as made of a woman, was actually made under the law on our account: 'When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son made of a woman made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.' (Gal. iv. 4, 5.) We appeal to the words of Christ himself, in which he reveals to us his design in coming into the world, and the nature of the work that he accomplished in it during his state of humiliation: 'I came down from heaven,' says he, 'not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.' 'It becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.' 'My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work.' 'As the Father gave me commandment, even so I do.' 'I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do.' 'He said, It is finished: and he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost.' (John vi. 38; Matt. iii. 15; John iv. 34; xiv. 31; xvii. 4; xix. 20.) We appeal to the name that is given to Christ in consequence of the perfect obedience which he gave to the law of God on our account: 'This is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.' (Jer. xxiii. 6.) And

we appeal, finally, in proof of this doctrine, to the undeniable fact, that the work of Christ, in becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, is proclaimed to all in the gospel as the only ground on which they as sinners can obtain the justification of life.' 'Be it known unto you, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.' (Acts xiii. 38, 39.) Is it not evident, from these passages of scripture, that the Father gave to the Son, as our surety, a commandment to yield obedience to the law which men had violated, and were bound to keep; that the Son gave perfect obedience to this commandment he received of his Father; and that his substitutionary obedience to the law of God is the condition on which the promises made to him were to be accomplished, and on which all who believe in him were to receive the adoption of sons and the justification of life? The covenant of grace in its aspect to Christ as our representative was in reality a covenant of works. As it was by the disobedience of the first Adam that all were made sinners; so it is by the obedience of the last Adam that many shall be made righteous.

Secondly, The condition of the covenant of grace consists, also, in the full endurance of the penalty incurred by the transgression of the law of God.

The condition of the covenant of works consisted simply in perfect obedience to the precepts of the law; but the condition of the covenant of grace consists, not merely in this, but also in the suffering of death. In the law of works, death was threatened as the penalty of transgression. When, therefore, Adam, as the representative of all mankind, violated that law, he and all his descendants, in consequence of his sin, became subject to death, the curse of the law. All men, however, are not only born under the curse of the law of works on account of Adam's sin, but they also deserve the wrath and curse of God, both in this life and in that which is to come, on account of their personal transgressions: 'The soul that sinneth,' says God, 'it shall die;' and again, 'Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.' If death, then, was the curse of the law of works, and if it is also the curse denounced by God against men on account of their personal sins, it is evident, if God were to deal with sinners according to the strict letter of the law, that he would inflict death on them, or visit all with his wrath and curse, both in this life and in that which is to come. And if the claims of his righteous law cannot be dispensed with, it is further evident, that having in sovereign goodness laid our help upon One that is mighty, he must, as the righteous Governor of all, and as faithful to his word, inflict on him, as our surety, death—the

penalty of transgression. How could the authority of the law be vindicated, and the efficiency of the moral government of God throughout the universe maintained, if sinners were suffered to violate his laws with impunity, or if pardon were dispensed to them without satisfaction for their sins? 'It became him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.' Hence we find, in the transactions of Deity, that the Father gave a commandment to the Son, as his servant and our representative, to lay down his life for the salvation of his people: 'No man,' says Christ, 'taketh my life from me; but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father.' And hence we also find, that suffering unto death forms a principal part of the condition of the covenant of grace, on the performance of which the Father promises to give the Son a numerous spiritual offspring as his reward: 'If his soul,' says God by Isaiah, 'shall make a propitiatory sacrifice, he shall see a seed which shall prolong their days, and the gracious purpose of Jehovah shall prosper in his hands.'

It is further to be observed that the Father in the covenant of grace not only prescribed to the Son the condition on which sinners were to be saved, but that the Son voluntarily engaged to perform that condition.

Hence says the Saviour, 'Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart;' and hence says an apostle, 'By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.' (Ps. xl. 7, 8; Heb. x. 10.)

On the whole, we conclude that in the covenant of grace the Father required of the Son, as his servant and as the representative of his people, that he should in the human nature give perfect obedience to the law which man had violated, and suffer death, the penalty he had incurred, and that the Son engaged to do these things according to the will of the Father. And we further conclude, that the obedience of Christ unto death is the condition on which the Father promised to place the whole human race, as fallen in Adam, and all things beside, under his mediatorial government, and also promised to give him a definite portion of their number, and to bestow on them eternal life. These transactions between the Father and the Son in their economical characters, viewed in connection with the purpose of mercy, and as one of the means of its accomplishment, are the grounds on which the mediatorial dispensation, as a form of moral government, is addressed to sinners of the human race generally, and on which also, through the special influences of the Holy Spirit, it is made an effectual means of saving all who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ.

4. We observe, lastly, that the performance of the condition of the covenant of grace by Christ was not enforced by the threatening of any penalty.

There is a manifest difference in this respect between the covenant of works which God established with Adam, as the federal head of all his posterity, and the covenant which he established with Christ, as the federal head of his spiritual offspring. Obedience to the law of works was enforced by a penalty. God said to Adam, 'In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.' But in the covenant of grace the Father did not require the Son to give obedience unto death under the sanction of any penalty whatever. This difference is easily accounted for: Adam might violate the law of works, because he was a mere man, and therefore necessarily fallible; but the second Adam could not violate the law under which he was placed, because he was 'the Lord from heaven,'—God in the human nature, and therefore necessarily infallible. Besides, the first Adam was in a state of probation in Eden, and might either by obedience or disobedience secure or forfeit the promised blessing. Whereas the last Adam was not in a similar condition, but merely in a state of humiliation, that he might in that condition give obedience unto death, and thereby secure the certain enjoyment of eternal life to all his spiritual offspring. While therefore there were good reasons for attaching a penalty to the law of works, there were no grounds whatever for the threatening

of a penalty in the covenant of grace. It was absolutely certain that Immanuel would become obedient unto death, according to the commandment he received of his Father: 'He shall not fail,' said Isaiah, 'nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth, and the isles shall wait for his law.'

The transactions between the Father and the Son, in their economical characters, which we have thus attempted to state and prove, are in the scriptures called a covenant: 'I have,' saith the Lord, 'made a covenant with my chosen.' (Ps. lxxxix. 3.) And the employment of this word by the Spirit of God to describe these transactions, appears to confirm the view we have given of them as consisting in *promises* and *commands*, given by the Father and received by the Son; for the Hebrew בְּרִית and the corresponding Greek word διαθήκη, both translated covenant, are frequently used in the scriptures to signify a promise and also a command or law. The word covenant is evidently used to denote a promise in Gen. xvii. 4–8, and in Gal. iii. 14–17. It is also used to signify a command or law in Gen. xvii. 9, 10; in Deut. ix. 9; in Acts vii. 8; and in Heb. ix. 20. The reader will perceive, by examining these passages of scripture, that the word covenant is not only used to signify a promise, and also a command or law, but that the promises and commands which God gave to Abraham and his descendants were of a federal character. By these God established a covenant between himself and Abraham and his seed after him, to be

his God and their God. (Gen. xvii. 7.) The word covenant, indeed, also means a divine constitution or appointment, and is often used in regard to objects where the idea of agreement, or mutual arrangement between parties, cannot be included, as in Gen. ix. 10, and in Hos. ii. 18. It means also a dispensation or economy, and is used to denote the Mosaic and Christian administrations of the covenant of grace, as in Heb. viii. 7–13. But it is evident, from the very nature of the things spoken of, that these last two acceptations of the word are not applicable to the subject in question; and therefore we conclude that the word covenant, as applied to those transactions which took place between the Father and the Son, in the economical relations which they sustain to each other and to men in the scheme of redemption, is used in the first two senses of the term, and that it is designed to teach us that these transactions were of a federal nature, and consist in those promises and commands which the Father addressed to the Son in his official character, and which the Son voluntarily received and engaged to obey.

The transactions between the Father and the Son of which we are speaking are, by theologians, commonly called the covenant of grace. We do not indeed find this appellation given to them in the holy scriptures; but it is nevertheless proper and warrantable to employ it; because these transactions originate in the sovereignty of divine love, and because all the benefits

and blessings which God bestows on men in consequence of them, are communicated gratuitously according to the good pleasure of his will.

SECT. III.—*The purpose of mercy is accomplished by means of the work that Christ performed in fulfilling the condition of the covenant of grace.*

We have already shown that the Father, in the covenant of grace, gave a promise to the Son, as his servant, to place the whole human family, as fallen in Adam, and all things besides, under his mediatorial government; and further, that he gave to him, as the representative of a definite number of the race, a promise to save them with an everlasting salvation—that the Father prescribed obedience unto death as the condition on which these promises were to be accomplished, and that the Son engaged to perform this work as the stipulated condition of their fulfilment—and that the purpose of mercy is accomplished by means of these covenant transactions between the Father, as sustaining the majesty and rights of Deity, and the Son, as constituted his servant and our representative. We now proceed to show that the Mediator, as another means of salvation, has fulfilled the condition of the covenant, according to the will of the Father, and his own engagement.

In considering this important branch of the subject, we shall direct the attention of the reader—

I. To the constitution of the mediatorial character of Jesus Christ.

II. To the work which he performed in his state of humiliation on earth, as the fulfilment of the condition of the covenant of grace.

III. To the perfection of that work.

IV. To its value.

V. To its efficacy.

VI. To its extent.

VII. And lastly, to its necessity for the accomplishment of the ends of the purpose of mercy.

I. *The constitution of Christ's mediatorial character.*

The Son of God was fitted by the mysterious constitution of his mediatorial character for fulfilling the condition of the covenant of grace. The condition of the covenant, as we have seen, consists in two things: in perfect obedience to the preceptive part of the divine law, and in the suffering of death as the ordained penalty of its transgression. Now, if the Mediator is a divine person, 'God over all, blessed for ever,' and if it is a dictate of reason and a doctrine of revelation that Deity, viewed abstractly, can neither obey nor suffer—that God cannot die—then it follows that he could not, simply in the divine nature, fulfil this condition. If, therefore, the Mediator, as God, could not become obedient unto death, it was evidently necessary that he should assume a created nature in order to fit him for the accomplishment of this work;

and as he had engaged to die for men, that this nature should be the human, and not the angelic. Under the Edenic law, life was promised on the condition of *man's* obedience. But how could this law be established and honoured if angelic obedience had been substituted in the place of that which is human? 'Since by man came death, by man also must come the resurrection of the dead.' 'If an atonement,' says Dr Dick, 'was necessary, we cannot conceive it to have been made by the sufferings of any other nature than that which had incurred the penalty of sin. No such relation could have been established between two beings of totally different natures, between a man and an angel, that in consequence of it, what was done by the latter should have been accepted as if it had been done by the former. We can understand how the services of an individual may be admitted as an equivalent for the services of the whole class to which he belongs; but there is no principle on which we could account for the same mode of estimating the services of an individual of a different class. If an angel had suffered, there would have been no display of the righteousness of God, as in that case the nature which had sinned would have escaped with impunity. It behoved the Surety in this case to be closely allied to the debtors, bone of their bone, and flesh of their flesh, that he might be identified with them in legal reckoning.'— Dr Dick's Theology, Lect. 53.) As, therefore, the assumption of human nature was necessary to qualify the Son of God for

yielding obedience unto death, and to give man a beneficiary interest in his work, so we find that he actually allied himself by a union of nature with those he came to save, that he might be their kinsman Redeemer. He took to himself the nature of man in its two constituent elements, of a true body and a reasonable soul: 'Forasmuch, then, as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil, and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily he took not hold of angels, but he took hold of the seed of Abraham,'—that is, to save them.

The human nature which the Son of God thus assumed was a *holy* human nature. The perfect holiness of the human nature was necessary to fit it for union to his divine nature, and that he might thereby make reconciliation for the sins of the people. The Saviour, accordingly, was born in a state of perfect holiness, and not in a state of depravity, like the natural descendants of Adam. This is accounted for on the principle that Adam did not represent or act for him under the law of Eden; and, hence, unlike every other partaker of human nature, he did not descend from him by ordinary generation, but was created directly by the agency of the Holy Ghost, and therefore in a state of perfect purity: 'The Holy Ghost,' said the angel unto Mary, 'shall

come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, therefore, also, that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God.'

The human nature of the Redeemer, it should also be observed, had no distinct personality. The personality of an individual includes the ideas of distinct subsistence and of separate agency; but the human nature of Christ, though necessarily different from his divine nature, and not blended with it, never subsisted by itself as human persons do. In the very act of its creation it was united to a divine person. The Son of God made it his own by giving it a subsistence in himself. Nor did the human nature of Christ possess a power of agency separate from that of his divine nature. The union of these natures neither destroyed nor affected the unity of the personality and agency of the second person in the Godhead. This remains immutably the same. Were it otherwise, would not the Mediator be two separate agents, and not *one*, as the scriptures affirm? And would not the acts and sufferings of the man Christ Jesus be the acts and sufferings of a mere human person, and therefore not attributable to the agency of the Son of God? Admit the personality of Christ as a man, and how could we explain the words of an apostle, when he says, 'Jesus Christ gave himself for us. He offered up himself; and he hath purchased the church with his own blood'? And how could

the ransomed of the Lord fall down before the Lamb and sing the new song, 'Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood'? These and similar texts plainly teach us, that there is unity of agency in the work which the Saviour accomplished for our redemption. Admit the personality of Christ as a man, and would not his obedience as a created agent be due to God on his own account, and therefore not imputable to others? For these reasons we conclude, that the Son of God became man, and so was, and continueth to be, both God and man, in two distinct natures, and one person for ever.

Theologians often speak of the union of the human nature to the Son of God, 'as the constitution of the person of Christ.' This expression is inaccurate, *first*, because the personality of the Son, like that of the Father and Holy Spirit, is eternally and immutably the same, and therefore not susceptible of being constituted; and, *secondly*, because it represents his personality as dependent, in some degree, on the act of his will in humbling himself to take upon him the form of a servant, and to be made in the likness of man, whereas his personality is an essential part of his nature as a divine being, and therefore necessary and independent of volition. We have spoken of the union of the divine and human natures in the Mediator, viewing that event in connection with the purpose of mercy, and with the covenant transactions between the Father and the Son, not as the constitu-

tion of the person of Christ, but as *the constitution of his mediatorial character*, because this view of the subject, as it appears to us, does not involve the idea that his incarnation produced any change whatever on the Son of God in regard to his personality, but simply represents that event in its purpose and accomplishment, as effecting such a change in those relations which, as a divine person, he sustained to God and man, as qualified him to mediate between them, and to perform those works that were necessary for the manifestation of the divine glory in the salvation of sinners.

The Son of God, in consequence of the wonderful and mysterious constitution of his mediatorial character, was fully qualified to fulfil the condition of the covenant of grace, according to the appointment of the Father and his own engagement. Was it necessary to the glory of God, and for man's salvation, that he should give obedience to the preceptive part of the law? He, as a partaker of the human nature in a state of holiness, was fitted to give perfect obedience to all its commandments. Was it necessary for the same ends that he should suffer death, the penalty of transgression? He, as our great high priest, 'had somewhat to offer,' even a life that was his own, and at his own disposal, and which he could righteously give as a ransom for many. Nor could he fail, like the first Adam, in fulfilling the condition of the covenant of life; for he was not a mere man,

and therefore fallible, but a divine person in the human nature, and therefore necessarily infallible. The Redeemer of Israel is mighty to save. 'I have,' says God, 'laid help upon One that is mighty; I have exalted One chosen out of the people.'

II. *The work performed by Christ.*

The Son of God actually fulfilled the condition of the covenant of grace by the works which he performed in the human nature during his state of humiliation at the fulness of time. The condition of the covenant of grace, as has been already shown, consists in two things, *first*, in perfect obedience to the preceptive part of the divine law, and, *secondly*, in the suffering of death as the penalty which man has incurred by the transgression of it. And we now observe that the Mediator has fulfilled this condition by actually giving obedience to the commands of the law, and by suffering death, the penalty of its transgression.

1. *The Saviour, in the days of his humiliation, gave perfect obedience to the precepts of the divine law.* When the Son of God became man, he then actually placed himself under the obligations of the law which sinners had violated. 'When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, *made of a woman, made under the law.*' The design of the Saviour in placing himself in this position was to give perfect obedience to the law of God, and to fulfil all

righteousness. 'I came down from heaven,' says he, 'not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.' (John vi. 38.) 'Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled.' (Matt. v. 17, 18.) As it became the Mediator to fulfil all righteousness, and as he came into the world to yield perfect obedience to the preceptive part of the law, which man had dishonoured and violated, so we find that he fully accomplished this work, and glorified God in his state of humiliation on earth, by a life of perfect obedience to his will in all things. 'The Father,' says he, 'hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please him.' And again he says, 'That the world may know that I love the Father, and as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do.' These texts unequivocally teach us that the Saviour kept all the commandments of God without exception, and that he uniformly received the approbation of the Father in consequence of the perfection of his obedience.

2. The Lord Jesus Christ, however, did not only yield perfect obedience to the preceptive part of the divine law, but *he also suffered death, the penalty of its transgression.*

All mankind are born and live under the curse of the Edenic law, in consequence of the disobedience of

Adam as their federal representative, and of the sentence of condemnation which God, according to the terms of that constitution, judicially pronounced against the race on account of his transgression. 'We are all by nature (by birth) children of wrath.' Now, as all men are born under the curse of the law of works, it was necessary to our salvation that the Son of God, as made of a woman, should not only be made under the law as a covenant of works; but that he should also be made under its curse as a broken covenant. 'Without shedding of blood is no remission.' Hence, in becoming man, he not merely placed himself under the obligations of the law, in so far as it requires obedience to its precepts; but he also placed himself in a position of subjection to the sentence of death which God passed upon all men, for that all have sinned, and consequently suffered death as the curse of the law. 'He was made a curse for us.' Did the curse of the law condemn man to eat bread in the sweat of his face? The man Christ Jesus laboured as a carpenter for his temporal sustenance. Did the curse of the law condemn man to eat bread in sorrow all the days of his life? Jesus was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. Did the curse of the law condemn man to death, saying, Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return? Jesus died the cursed death of the cross. Did the curse of the law condemn man to suffer the wrath of God, of which these and other evils were only the visible tokens?

The Shepherd of the sheep—the Man Jehovah's Fellow, was smitten to death by the sword of divine justice. 'It pleased the Lord to bruise him—to crush him with affliction.'—(Lowth.)

All mankind, however, are not only obnoxious to the curse of the law on account of the sin of Adam, but they are also obnoxious to the wrath of God in consequence of their personal transgressions. 'God is angry with the wicked every day.' 'Cursed,' says God, 'is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them. The soul that sinneth it shall die.' Now, as all men are under the curse of the law on account of their own sins, it was therefore necessary that the Saviour should be made under the law in this aspect of it also, that he might bear the punishment due to us on account of our personal transgressions, and deliver us from the wrath to come. Hence it is said, 'He was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities.' And again, 'Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.' (Gal. iii. 13.) The argument of the apostle in this text or context is as follows: 'The law pronounces accursed all who do not obey every command; no man has ever rendered this perfect obedience, therefore all men are under the curse: but Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, having been made a curse for us. There can be no doubt what the apostle means when he says, that all men are

under the curse, nor when he says, Cursed is every one who continueth not in all things written in the law to do them; neither can it be doubted what he means when he says, Christ was made a curse. The three expressions, under the curse, accursed, and made a curse, cannot mean essentially different things. If the former mean that we are exposed to the penalty, the latter must mean that Christ endured the penalty. He hath redeemed us from the curse, by bearing it in our stead.'—(Princeton Theol. Essays, p. 327.)

It should be carefully observed, that the curse of the law, in its nature and equity, is the principle which determined and regulated both the *kind* and *amount* of those sufferings which Christ endured in our stead.

The *kind* of sufferings that the Saviour endured was not determined by the kind of sufferings which the wicked shall bear in the place of woe—as if it were necessary that his sufferings should in every thing be the same as theirs—but is determined exclusively *by the nature of the penalty of the law, even the wrath of Jehovah.* In hell the wicked shall suffer remorse and despair. These feelings, however, are not founded on the curse of the law, but on the character of the persons subjected to it. The feeling of remorse has evidently a relation to the precepts of the law, and arises in the mind of the sinner from a consciousness of his transgressions. The feeling of despair has a relation to his condition, as in a state of subjection to the curse of the law, and arises in his mind from a

thorough conviction of his incapacity to deliver himself from the wrath of God, in which it consists. But the Saviour did not, and could not, endure either of these feelings. He could not suffer the feeling of remorse, because he was perfectly holy, and 'knew no sin.' He could not suffer the feeling of despair, because he was able to bear the curse of the law, and to effect his own deliverance from it as our surety, and also the deliverance of all those whom he represented. The imputation of our sins to Christ did not make him a sinner and blameworthy in the sight of God, but simply placed him under our legal responsibilities as sinners—that is, to bear the wrath of God as the penal consequence of our transgressions.

Neither is the *amount* of suffering which Christ endured to be measured by the amount of suffering from which believers are delivered. Sinners deserve to suffer the infinite wrath of Jehovah, and if they were to reap the fruit of their evil ways, they must necessarily suffer for ever and ever. But it was not necessary that the Saviour should suffer eternally; because though his sufferings in themselves were finite, being endured only in the human nature, yet as that nature had no distinct personality, but was united to the person of the Son of God, his sufferings, in consequence of this union, had a value relatively infinite—infinite in degree, though limited in duration. He who was crucified was the Lord of Glory.

Nor is the *amount* of Christ's sufferings to be

measured by the number of those who are saved. Some theologians have supposed that the amount of Christ's sufferings is determined by the sufferings due to those who are to be saved, and that if a single individual were added to their number, his sufferings must have been proportionally increased. But if the number of those who are saved depends solely on the grace of God, as is confessedly the case, does not this hypothesis evidently take the punishment of sin from the province of equity, to which it exclusively belongs, and transfer it to that of sovereignty, with which it has no connection? It is not the sovereignty of God, as manifested either in the numbers of those that are saved, or in the character of the salvation he bestows on them, which determines the amount of Christ's sufferings, but the equity of the law and the justice of its curse. Besides, Christ's work, on this hypothesis, could not be perfect, seeing additional sufferings would be necessary were a single individual added to the number of God's elect. And how, on this principle, could the obedience of Christ unto death be revealed as a perfect righteousness, and as all-sufficient in its very nature to sustain the confidence and hopes of every sinner for eternity? and how could all men indiscriminately be commanded to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ that they may be saved? For these reasons we conclude, that the curse of the law, in its nature and equity, is the principle which determined and regulated both the kind and amount of the

sufferings that Christ had to endure for the salvation of sinners. The kind of these sufferings we have already, to some extent, indicated: the amount of them we presume not to describe. It is a subject too high and awful for the limited faculties of man to comprehend. 'Our God is a consuming fire.' 'O Lord, who knoweth the power of thine anger? even according to thy fear so is thy wrath.'

On the whole, we conclude, that the Son of God in the human nature did actually give perfect obedience to the preceptive part of the divine law, and that he also suffered death, the penalty of its transgression; or in the language of an apostle, which comprehends these two things in one expression, that he 'became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross;' and that by this work he did completely fulfil the condition of the covenant of grace. It should be carefully observed, however, that neither of these two things separately is the condition of the covenant of grace, but that both of them are comprehended in that righteousness on the ground of which God justifieth the ungodly. When it is said that we are 'justified by Christ's blood,' as in Rom. v. 9, and elsewhere, this statement does not mean, that his death, viewed abstractly, is the ground of justification, but that it is so, viewed as the consummating and crowning act of that work of obedience to the will of God, which he performed according to the commandment he received of his Father. His obedience unto death was

not restricted to the hour when he gave up the ghost on Calvary, nor even to the period of his public ministry; for he was occupied about his Father's business when twelve years of age, and nothing that he did and suffered from the time of his birth until the hour of his death, was done or suffered for himself, but for those in whose name he acted as the Father's servant and a federal representative.

How inconceivably marvellous in its nature, and how ineffably glorious in its results, is that obedience unto death which the Son as mediator gave to the Father at the fulness of time, for the salvation of sinful and perishing men! The hour of his decease at Jerusalem is unquestionably the most important and eventful hour to our fallen race since hours began to be numbered. That hour is, as it were, the conflux of two eternities, the one stretching backward to the never-beginning past, and the other stretching forward to the never-ending future. To the events of that hour everything under the Patriarchal and Levitical dispensations had a prospective reference, and everything under the New Testament economy has a retrospective reference. The death of Christ, in its antecedents and consequences, is an event by which the purpose of mercy is accomplished,—by which the predictions and promises respecting the Shiloh were fulfilled,—by which the typical institutions of the law were substantiated,—by which the redemption of the church was achieved,—which im-

parts to the revelations and institutions of the New Testament dispensation all their importance and saving efficacy,—and by which the Father is to gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him. This is the work by which Jesus 'cast out the prince of this world,' spoiled principalities and powers, made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in his cross, and by which he delivered them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.

The Saviour, it should be observed, vanquished the serpent, not by the power of his almighty arm, or by physical force, but *by moral means*—by his obedience and death. He vindicated the righteousness and goodness of the law, which Satan had tempted man to break, and the truth of the threatening which he had tempted man to disbelieve, by giving obedience to its precepts, and by suffering death, its penalty, in the room of transgressors. It was in this manner, and by these moral means, that the Saviour destroyed the works of the devil. '*Through death* he destroyed him,' says an apostle, 'that had the power of death, that is the devil.' The death of Christ, therefore, is that event through which the kingdom of Satan, in all the forms of its existence among men, is ultimately to be subverted, and in consequence of which the God of heaven has set up in our world, that kingdom of righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost, which shall never

be destroyed, and which, after having broken in pieces and consumed all hostile kingdoms, shall stand for ever. In reflecting on the wonderful nature of Christ's work, and on its glorious results, we are constrained to exclaim with an apostle, 'O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!'

III. *The perfection of the work of Christ.*

1. That the work of our Lord Jesus Christ, in giving obedience unto death, was absolutely perfect, is evident, *from the very nature of the work itself.* The perfection of obedience consists in its exact conformity to the will of God. Now if, as we have shown in the preceding observation, our Lord Jesus Christ actually obeyed all the precepts of the law which man had violated;—if he suffered death, the penalty of the law which he had incurred;—and if he has thus fulfilled the law, in regard both to its precepts and its penalty, as the condition of the covenant of grace; then it follows that his work must be perfect, for it is in exact conformity with the will of God, and the stipulated condition on which his gracious designs in the purpose of mercy are to be accomplished.

2. That the obedience of Christ unto death was absolutely perfect, is further evident *from the terms which the Holy Ghost employs in describing it.* These

terms in general are of two classes: *first*, such as have a reference to the NATURE of Christ's work, and, *secondly*, such as have a reference to its EFFECTS.

First, The terms which have a reference to the NATURE of the work that Christ performed for our salvation are generally the following, — *obedience—obedience unto death—an offering and a sacrifice—propitiation—price and ransom—righteousness—and the work which the Father gave him to do.* All these words or phrases appear to have been employed by the Spirit for the twofold purpose of illustrating the nature of that work, and of attesting its absolute perfection.

The work of Christ in its nature is obedience unto death.

The work of Christ, in regard to its nature, is described as consisting *in obedience to the will of God.* 'Jesus Christ,' says an apostle, 'became obedient unto death;' and again, 'By the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.' This description of the work of Christ has a reference to God in his character as a lawgiver, and to the will of the Father, which the Son as mediator had engaged to obey, that believers might obtain, through his vicarious obedience unto death, the justification of life; and it evidently teaches us that the obedience which he gave to the law of God was perfect. If he had offended in one point, the Spirit of truth never could have said that he became obedient unto death.

The death of Christ in its nature is an offering and a sacrifice.

The death of Christ, in regard to its nature, is further described as an *offering* and a *sacrifice* to God for sinners. In proof of this, we quote the following passages of holy writ, in which these terms are either directly employed by the Spirit of God to describe the nature of Christ's death, or in which, by the use of a different phraseology, he as plainly teaches us its sacrificial character: 'He hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour.' (Eph. v. 2.) 'God hath made him to be sin (a sin-offering) for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.' (2 Cor. v. 21.) 'Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures.' (1 Cor. xv. 3.) 'He, his own self, bare our sins in his own body on the tree.' (1 Pet. ii. 24.) 'Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God.' (1 Pet. iii. 18.) 'Once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many.' (Heb. ix. 26, 28.) These and many similar texts of scripture plainly teach us that the death of Christ is a true and proper sacrifice, which as a priest he offered to God in the stead of sinners. No man can deny this, but the man who presumptuously refuses to submit to the Word of God as the standard of religious belief.

This description of the death of Christ has a reference to the whole sacrificial system of worship that existed from the days of Adam until the last passover which Christ observed with his disciples, and plainly teaches us that he has accomplished the design of that system, and fulfilled all the typical sacrifices of the law by the one sacrifice of himself. In contemplating the death of Christ as the antitypical and true sacrifice for sin, we might show, that in this aspect of it, it had a special relation to God as an offended lawgiver, and to his wrath, as the penalty which man had incurred by transgression—that as the sacrifices of the law were substituted in the room of the persons who offered them, so Christ died as a substitute in the room of the guilty—that as the guilt of the sins of the offerer under the law was transferred to the victim by the act of laying his hands upon its head, with the accompanying confession over him of all his iniquities, so the guilt of our sins has been imputed to Christ, that he might bear the punishment which we deserved to suffer on account of them—that as the victim under the law, when substituted in the room of the offender, and laden with his iniquities, was actually slain in his stead, and life given for life, so Christ was truly sacrificed and slain for us — that as all the sacrifices under the law had a relation to the covenant which God made with the Israelites, and were to be offered up as the means of obtaining its promised blessings, so the death of Christ, as the antitypical

and true sacrifice for sinners, has a relation to the covenant of grace, and was offered up by him as the condition of its fulfilment, and that those who believe on him might be saved; and we might also show that as the sacrifices of the law, when scripturally presented, were always efficacious as means for accomplishing the ends of their appointment, so the sacrifice of Christ, or the shedding of his blood as the blood of the covenant, has secured the accomplishment of the objects of the purpose of mercy, and rendered it absolutely certain that every one who believes on his name shall be saved. (Heb. ix. 13, 14.) But it is sufficient for our present purpose to observe, that the offering or sacrifice of himself, which Christ gave to God for us, was absolutely perfect. 'In the sacrificial terms, προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν, offering and sacrifice, used in Eph. v. 2, and in Heb. x. 5, we need not, with some eminent expositors, make the distinction between bloody and unbloody sacrifices or sin-offerings and peace-offerings, but the two terms may be regarded as conjoined, in order to denote the *completeness* of the sacrifice.'—(Bloomfield in loco.)

In proof that the sacrifice of Christ was absolutely perfect, we appeal, *first*, to the nature of the sacrifice itself. The great High Priest of the covenant did not, like the Jewish high priest, offer the blood of bulls and of goats, which could not take away sin, but he gave *himself* for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity. We appeal, *secondly*, to the circumstance

that he offered himself only *once*. The sacrifice that he offered to take away sin did not need to be repeated: 'Christ was *once* offered to bear the sins of many, and he his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree,' that is, he suffered death, the penalty of the law, and thus secured the deliverance of 'the many' from the punishment due to them on account of sin. 'Every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins. But this priest, after he had offered *one sacrifice* for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For by *one offering* he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.' (Heb. x. 11–14.) And, *lastly*, in proof that the sacrifice of Christ was absolutely perfect, we appeal to the fact of its *acceptance* of the Father as a propitiatory sacrifice. It was of 'a sweet-smelling savour.' In evidence of this, 'God raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory, that our faith and hope might be in God; and exalted him with his right hand a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins.'

The death of Christ in its nature is a propitiatory sacrifice.

The death of Christ, in regard to its nature, is described as a *propitiatory* sacrifice. 'God,' says the apostle John, 'loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation (ἱλασμὸν) for our sins.' (1 John iv.

10.) And again says he, 'He is the propitiation (ἱλασμός) for our sins.' (Chap. ii. 2.) The view of the death of Christ which the Spirit of God gives us in these texts has a relation to God as angry with men on account of their sins, and obviously teaches us that he is propitiated, or turns away his wrath from them, in consequence of the sufferings which the Saviour endured in their stead. The word ἱλασμός, propitiation, which occurs only in these two passages of the New Testament scriptures, is derived from ἱλάσκομαι or ἱλάομαι, which signifies to appease, to propitiate. This verb, like its derivative, occurs only twice in the New Testament, and the sense in which it is used in these two passages will guide us in determining the idea that is expressed by the noun rendered 'propitiation.' 1st, It is employed in Heb. ii. 17, to describe the nature of Christ's work as the great High Priest of the church: 'Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation (ἱλάσκεσθαι, to make propitiation) for the sins of the people,' or to turn away his wrath, and secure to them the blessings of his favour. The word suggests the *purpose* of Christ's priesthood, namely, to expiate the sins of the people. 'Ιλάσκεσθαι answers in the Septuagint to the Hebrew כָּפַר, to cover, remove from sight, and as used of sins to forgive.'—(Bloomfield in loco.) 2d. It is also employed by our Lord in

describing the nature of that religious exercise which is suitable to a sinner and acceptable in the sight of God. 'God be merciful (ἱλάσθητί, be propitiated or propitious) to me the sinner.' If the verb ἱλάσκομαι thus means to propitiate or to turn away the wrath of God from sinners, then the noun ἱλασμός, derived from that verb, must denote the work which the propitiator performs to effect this result. Accordingly, we find that in the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament it is sometimes employed to denote the sin-offering by which the priest made an atonement for transgressions before the Lord. Thus, in Numb. v. 8, the trespass-offering, whereby an atonement was to be made for any man or woman who committed any sin against the Lord, is called 'the ram of the atonement,' or trespass-offering, (πλὴν τοῦ κριοῦ τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ. Compare with Lev. vi. 6, 7.) And in Ezek. xliv. 27, προσφέρειν ἱλασμὸν, is to offer a sin-offering. If, therefore, the word ἱλασμός is used by the seventy to denote the sin-offering by which the priest made propitiation for the offerer under the law, and if this acceptation of the word is in harmony with its etymological meaning, are we not thereby warranted to conclude, from the language of the apostle, in calling Jesus Christ the propitiation for our sins, that he is the great anti-typical sin-offering of the church—that his death, in its very nature, is a propitiatory sacrifice—and that it is the means through which he is accessible to sinners indiscriminately, and by which he, as our Advocate

with the Father, actually makes propitiation for the sins of his people? Does not the man do violence to this language who denies that the shedding, in connection with the sprinkling of his blood, is the means by which God is rendered propitious to sinners? It is a truth, that God has been so far propitiated thereby as not to leave the human race in the present world irremediably under the condemnatory sentence of the covenant of works, but to place them under the mediatorial government of the Lord Jesus Christ. And it is also a truth, that God is so propitiated thereby as actually to turn away his anger from, and to bestow pardon and all the blessings of his love upon, every one of the race who believes on the Lord Jesus Christ, according to the requisitions of that economy. But as men are sinful beings, and as God bestows both the outward privileges of the gospel, and its saving blessings through Jesus Christ the Mediator, how could these two undeniable facts be satisfactorily accounted for, if the sacrifice of himself were not of a propitiatory nature? And how could that sacrifice be the means of accomplishing these two great ends of the purpose of mercy in regard to man, if it were not absolutely perfect, and of a sweet-smelling savour to God?

The death of Christ in its nature is a ransom, or price.

The work of the Saviour, in regard to its nature, is described as a *ransom*, or *price*, paid for our redemption. 'The Son of man,' said the Saviour to

his apostles, 'came not to be ministered unto; but to minister, and to give his life a ransom (λύτρον) for many' (Matt. xx. 28); and 'Christ Jesus,' says the apostle Paul, 'gave himself a ransom (ἀντίλυτρον) for all, to be testified in due time.' (1 Tim. ii. 6.) In harmony with these statements, we find that believers are often spoken of in scripture as redeemed by the blood of Christ: 'Ye are bought with a price, ('Ηγοράσθητε τιμῆς) therefore, glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's.' These terms, ransom and price, relate to the condition of sinners as in a state of captivity to sin and Satan, and as deserving of death on account of their transgressions, and describe the means by which God delivers them from this miserable condition. They plainly teach us, that the ransom or price which Christ gave for their deliverance, was his own life. These terms are not to be confounded with the redemption (ἀπολύτρωσις) spoken of in 1 Cor. i. 30; Eph. i. 7–14, et. al., —the redemption which sinners actually obtain in the day of conversion—but denote simply the ground on which this deliverance is effected. The word ἀντίλυτρον, ransom, used in Timothy, properly signifies *a price*, by which captives are redeemed from the enemy, and that kind of exchange in which *the life of one is redeemed by the life of another*.—(Parkhurst's Lex.) The word, λύτρον, ransom, used in Matthew, signifies the price paid for the redemption of a captive, whether that price is a sum of money or the life of a substitute;

but in its application to Christ's work, it is evidently used, and that exclusively, in the latter acceptation,—in the same sense as ἀντίλυτρον in Timothy; for it is expressly said, that he 'gave *his life* a ransom for many.' From these statements, therefore, we conclude, in the language of an apostle, that the children of God 'were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, . . . but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.'

The reader will observe that it is sinners personally, and not the blessings of salvation, who are bought with the price of Christ's blood. The death of Christ is the effect of God's love, and cannot therefore be the price by which it is purchased. On the contrary, it is the price paid for the redemption of sinners to the enjoyment of the blessings of that love. It is the church of God, which the Lord Jesus hath purchased with his own blood. Hence her genuine members are described as the *ransomed* of the Lord—as 'a *peculiar* people' (λαὸς ἐις περιποίησιν, a people for a possession; that is, an acquired or purchased people, 1 Pet. ii. 9); and as 'the purchased possession,' (ἐις ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως) until the redemption of the purchased people. (Eph. i. 14.) The word περιποιήσεως used here without λαος, says Parkhurst, 'means the people acquired or purchased—*the church* which περιεποιήσατο he hath purchased *with his own blood*.' (Acts xx. 28.)

It should also be observed, that the captivity under

which we suffer, and from which we need redemption, is the effect of our own agency in sinning against God. Like the Israelites of old, 'we have sold ourselves for nought to do evil in the sight of the Lord, to provoke him to anger.' Our spiritual bondage is voluntary, and the result of our foolish and evil choice. It is our sin. The work of Christ, therefore, in giving his life a ransom for our deliverance, cannot be a pecuniary satisfaction, like that transaction of the commercial world, in which a benefactor fully pays the debts of a bankrupt; but must be, from the very nature and circumstances of the case, a moral or penal satisfaction given to the Lawgiver on account of our transgressions. There is a manifest distinction between pecuniary and penal satisfaction, and the latter ought never to be confounded with the former: '1. In the one, the demand is upon the thing due, in the other case it is upon the person of the criminal; 2. Hence, the creditor is bound to accept the payment of the debt, no matter when or by whom offered; whereas in the case of a crime or sin, the sovereign is bound neither to provide a substitute nor to accept of one when offered. If he does either, it is a matter of grace; 3. Hence, penal satisfaction does not *ipso facto* liberate; the acceptance is a matter of arrangement or covenant, and the terms of that covenant must depend on the will of the parties.'—(Princeton Theol. Essays, p. 337.) If, therefore, the satisfaction of Christ was made to God for sinners as guilty in his sight, and if it consists

in giving his life, instead of their life as forfeited by transgression, then it is evident that it was not of a pecuniary, but of a moral and penal character, and also that it was given not to Satan, who first obtained dominion over man by tempting him to sin, and who still labours by his wiles to retain him in a state of spiritual bondage and under the sentence of death, but to God, whose laws they had broken, and whose wrath they had incurred.

On the whole, if Jesus Christ gave his life a ransom for many, it follows, from the very nature of the ransom, that his work, as their Redeemer, was perfect. Was not life for life the very thing necessary in equity for their redemption? Was it not such an equivalent, as fully met the exigencies of their condition, as subjected to death, the curse of the law? Was it not the very thing prescribed in the covenant of grace, as the condition of their salvation? And is it not the only ground on which they, in their respective generations, are actually delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God? Moreover, if the work of Christ, in giving his life a ransom for many, were not perfect, how could the righteous Father have honoured it with his approbation, and accepted it as the price of their deliverance? How could sinners obtain redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace? And how could they, as the ransomed of the Lord, sing the new song, 'Thou wast slain,

and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation, and hast made us unto our God, kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth?'

The work of Christ in its nature is righteousness.

The work of Christ in regard to its nature is described as *righteousness*. 'They,' says the apostle Paul, 'being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God, (τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ.) For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.' (Rom. x. 3, 4.) And again says he, 'As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one (δι' ἑνὸς δικαιώματος) the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.' (Rom. v. 18.) In these and many other parts of scripture the work of Christ, in giving obedience unto death for our salvation, is described as righteousness. In the latter of these texts the apostle evidently contrasts the offence of Adam and the righteousness of Christ, and distinctly affirms that as the sin of the first man is the ground on account of which judgment has come upon all men to condemnation, so the righteousness of Christ is the ground on account of which the free gift of righteousness comes upon all men who receive it by faith, unto justification of life. The righteousness of Christ, of which he here speaks, unquestionably means his obedience unto death, for this is the explanation

given of it in the following verse, where he says, 'For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.' Now in calling the obedience of Christ righteousness, does not the apostle thereby plainly teach us that his work, in becoming obedient unto death for our justification, was absolutely perfect? The word righteousness denotes thought, feeling, and action according to law. It stands in opposition to sin. As sin, therefore, consists in the transgression of the law of God, so righteousness must of necessity consist in obedience to its precepts. If then the obedience of Christ unto death is in this and other texts of scripture called righteousness, it is evident, from the meaning of the word, that his work, in fulfilling the law for us, must in its very nature have been absolutely perfect. Were it otherwise, would it not clearly be a deceptive misnomer to call it righteousness? Were it otherwise how could the Saviour be called the Lord our Righteousness, and be revealed to sinners as the object of faith and hope, by a name which implies that he has given perfect obedience to the law of God? And were it otherwise, how could Paul, or any of our race, ever be found in Christ, not having his own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith?

Obedience unto death is the work which the Father gave Christ to do.

Finally, the obedience of Christ unto death is spoken of in the scriptures as *the work which the Father gave him to do*. The covenant of grace, in its aspect to the Son of God as mediator, was like the law of Eden—a covenant of works. He was required to give perfect obedience to the law of God, both in regard to its precepts and penalty, as the condition on which he was to see his seed, and enter on the joy that was set before him. Now, we find that the obedience which Christ gave to the law of God, according to the appointment of the Father and his own engagement in the covenant of grace, is spoken of in the scriptures as the work of God, (John iv. 34)—as the work he was sent to perform, (John ix. 4)—and as the work which the Father had given him to finish, (John v. 36.) If, then, the Saviour did not fail, like the first Adam, in accomplishing the work which was given him to do, but actually fulfilled all righteousness, are we not warranted to conclude that his work was absolutely perfect? The truth of this conclusion is established beyond a doubt by the declaration he made to his Father, in his intercessory prayer: 'Father, I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do;' and by the last words he uttered on the cross: 'He said, It is finished, and he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost.'

On the whole here, if obedience unto death—an offering and a sacrifice for sin—the propitiation—a

ransom or price—righteousness—and the work given him to do, are the principal terms which the Spirit of God uses, in describing those services that the Saviour performed in his ministrations on earth, as the high priest of the covenant, we conclude that each and all of these illustrate the nature of his work, in giving himself for our redemption, and also establish the truth of our proposition, that his work was altogether perfect.

Secondly, The second class of terms which the Spirit of God employs in describing the work which the Saviour performed on earth for our salvation, and which also prove the perfection of that work, are such as have a reference to the EFFECTS it produced. These, in general, are the following, a *propitiatory covering*—*atonement* or *reconciliation*—*redemption* or *deliverance*—*sanctification* or *holiness*—and *salvation* or *everlasting life*. The terms of this class reveal to us the ends to which the work of Christ was subservient, and which it effectuated. Like those of the first class which have been already considered, they also illustrate the nature of his obedience unto death, and prove the truth of its absolute perfection.

Propitiation and pardon are effects of the death of Christ.

The obedience of Christ unto death is spoken of in the scriptures as the ground on which God is rendered propitious to sinners, and pardons their transgressions. 'All those that believe,' says the

apostle Paul, 'are justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation (προέθετο ἱλαστήριον, hath set forth a *propitiatory covering*), through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness, for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time, his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus.' (Rom. iii. 22–26.) The word, ἱλαστήριον, rendered in our version, 'a propitiation,' is, says Moses Stuart, 'an adjective used in an elliptical way, like other adjectives of a similar nature. The question naturally arises, what is the noun here to be supplied after ἱλαστήριον? Is it ἐπίθεμα cover, or θῦμα offering or sacrifice?' 'In answering this question,' he says, 'I most fully agree with Turretin, who understands by ἱλαστήριον, *an expiatory victim*.' Now, we humbly submit that ἐπίθεμα, a covering, and not θῦμα, a sacrifice, is the noun that should be supplied, for the following reasons:—1. Because the Hebrew noun כַּפֹּרֶת, literally means covering, and is translated by the Seventy ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα, a propitiatory covering, in Ex. xxv. 17. This is the name invariably given to the mercy-seat in the Hebrew scriptures, and generally in the Septuagint translation. In the latter, however, the noun is usually omitted, and it is simply called the ἱλαστήριον, as in Ex. xxv. 20, 21; Lev. xvi. 2, 13–15. 2. Because it is used to denote the mercy-seat in the only other passage of the New

Testament in which the word occurs; over it (the ark) the cherubims of glory overshadowing the mercy-seat (τὸ ἱλαστήριον.) (Heb. ix. 5.) Would we not, then, do violence to this text, which clearly determines its meaning, if we were to translate it an expiatory victim? Besides, would not such a translation confound the term with the noun ἱλασμός, used in 1 John ii. 2, and iv. 10, which, as we have seen, denotes the sacrificial victim or sin-offering by whose blood propitiation is made? 3. Because propitiation was made under the law on the great day of atonement, by means of the sprinkling of the blood of the sacrificial victim seven times upon the mercy-seat, and before the mercy-seat, and that accompanied with the burning of incense, or with intercession. (Lev. xvi. 13–15, 17.) Now, if there is an analogy between the typical representation of Christ's work, and that work itself, we must conclude that the Saviour propitiates Deity, and turns away his wrath from sinners, by the sprinkling of his blood before the Lord, or by appearing in the midst of the throne a Lamb as it had been slain, and by his intercession in heaven itself, the true holy place. Hence, when the apostle John speaks of him as the ἱλασμός—the expiatory victim for our sins, he associates his death with his intercession, as the means by which the wrath of God is appeased, and sinners pardoned and purified. 'If any man sin,' says he, 'we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our

sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.' (1 John ii. 1, 2.) The work that Christ performed on earth is the ground on which propitiation is made; the work that he performs in heaven is the means by which it is actually effected. (Heb. vii. 25.) These two things are so connected with each other, in the one great system of his mediatorial agency, that they can never be separated. And if so, we conclude, when the apostle says, Christ is set forth as the ἱλαστήριον,—the propitiatory covering or mercy-seat, that he does not directly refer to the blood of Christ as the ἱλασμός, the propitiatory victim which was shed for the remission of sins, though this is necessarily presupposed and included in the expression; but that he directly refers to his blood as sprinkled with accompanying intercession before the Lord in heaven, the true holy place—even to his blood as the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel. 4. And because the passage, as the context shows, does not immediately refer to the work of Christ in offering himself a sacrifice for sin, but to that revelation of him which God hath given in the gospel of his grace, both to Jews and Gentiles, without any difference, or to that administration of mercy which God hath established with men in consequence of his sacrifice. The subject of which the apostle is speaking is the actual justification of the ungodly by the grace of God through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, (verse 24,) that is, through the deliver-

ance which Christ effects in consequence of having given his life a ransom for many. If the question were asked, how is this justification vouchsafed and enjoyed? the apostle replies, 'Him hath God *set forth*, (προέθετο, hath publicly exposed to view, or openly exhibited in the gospel, and in gospel ordinances to the world,) *a propitiatory covering*,'—as the antitypical mercy-seat through which, as sprinkled with the blood of the expiatory victim, God pardons the guilty, and turns his anger away from them. Further, the apostle replies that he is set forth as a propitiatory '*through faith* in his blood,' as shed and sprinkled before the Lord, and published in the gospel, as the only ground on which God pardons sinners, and accepts them as righteous in his sight. 'God is just, and the justifier of him *who believeth* in Jesus,' (verse 26.) And, lastly, the apostle replies, that he is set forth as a propitiatory, that all the ends of the earth may look to him and be saved. Under the law, the mercy-seat was not exhibited openly to the Israelites, nor immediately accessible to them. It was only to be approached and seen by the high priest on the great day of atonement; but the mercy throne of the christian dispensation is openly revealed and accessible to all men through faith in the blood of Christ. 'The temple of God is now opened in heaven, and there is seen in his temple the ark of his testament, and all have now boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus.'

These four reasons, we submit, shut us up to the conclusion, that ἐπίθεμα, cover, and not θῦμα, sacrifice, is the proper noun to be supplied to ἱλαστήριον in this passage. Moses Stuart objects to this view of the subject, because to affirm that Christ is set forth as a propitiatory covering, is, as he supposes, to represent his blood, spoken of in the next clause of the verse, as sprinkled on himself. 'Such an image,' says he, 'is unnatural; for then Christ would be represented as a mercy-seat sprinkled with his *own* blood—an incongruous figure, if the analogy of the Jewish mercy-seat be consulted.' This objection, however, proceeds on a gratuitous assumption. The mercy-seat is to be contemplated in two aspects—1. It was the lid *or* covering of the ark, which contained the two tables of the covenant, or the laws of the mediatorial dispensation. In this aspect of it, it was not a *mercy-seat*, but simply the throne of government and law, on which Jehovah sat ruling as king over the Israelites, according to the law of the ten commandments; 2. It was also the covering of the ark, as sprinkled with the blood of the sin-offering. In this aspect of it, it was a *mercy-seat*, even the throne of mercy from which God revealed himself to the Israelites, as propitiated towards them in consequence of this sprinkling of blood,—and as ready to forgive all their sins in violating the laws of his government, if they would come to him, and seek this blessing of his love, in the way appointed in his word. It was the

sprinkling of the blood of the sin-offering on the cover of the ark, and this alone, which constituted that cover the ἱλαστήριον, or propitiatory covering. If, therefore, the thing sprinkled, namely, the blood of the sin-offering, is distinct from the cover of the ark, the thing on which it was sprinkled, then it is evident, that in speaking of Christ as the true ἱλαστήριον, we do not represent his blood as sprinkled on himself, but on the cover of the ark viewed as containing the laws by which God governs the world, and we consequently represent it as covering the sins, and securing, according to his covenant, the pardon of all those who trust on his work, as the ordained means of their redemption from the curse of the law.

There is evidently no incongruity in the language of the apostle, according to this view of the passage. But would there not be a manifest incongruity to suppose that there was nothing in the work which Christ performs in heaven, the true holy place, analogous to the typical sprinkling of the blood of the sin-offering, on and before the ark of the covenant, in the holiest of all of the Jewish temple? If it was by means of the services of the high priest, in sprinkling the blood of the sin-offering, and in burning incense before the Lord on the great day of atonement, that God was propitiated and turned away his wrath from his people under the typical dispensation; are we not from analogy warranted to conclude, that it is by means of the ministrations of the great antitypical High Priest

of the covenant, in sprinkling his blood and in making intercession before the Lord in heaven, the true holy place, that God is truly propitiated, and actually turns away his anger from those who believe in Jesus?

Now, if the word ἱλαστήριον, in Rom. iii. 25, means a propitiatory covering, and if, when the apostle says, God hath set forth Christ as a propitiatory covering through faith in his blood, his words do not immediately refer to the work which he accomplished on earth when he offered himself as the propitiatory victim for our sins; but directly to the work which he performs in heaven, the true holy place, when, as it were, he sprinkles his shed blood before the Lord, and also makes intercession for us, it follows that his words have a relation to the effects which result from the mediatorial agency of the High Priest of our profession, and that these effects must be analogous to the benefits which the Israelites enjoyed through the mercy-seat, or by means of the sacrifice of the sin-offering, and of the sprinkling of its blood on the ark of the covenant in the holiest of all, on the great day of atonement. What, then, were these effects?

These effects have, *first*, a relation to God as an offended lawgiver, and to men as the disobedient subjects of his moral government. God was so far propitiated by the sacrifice of the sin-offering, and by the sprinkling of its blood upon the mercy-seat, as to give to the Israelites, indiscriminately by the ministry

of Moses, a revelation of his will, and to institute among them ordinances of salvation. 'There,' says God to Moses, 'I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubims which are upon the ark of the testimony, *of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel.*' In like manner, God is so propitiated by the sacrifice of Christ, and by the sprinkling of his blood before the throne, as to give to men, as sinners and the subjects of his moral government, by Jesus Christ as mediator, a revelation of his will in the holy scriptures,—to establish ordinances of salvation amongst them,—and to command all of them indiscriminately 'to hear him in all things whatsoever he shall say unto them, that they may be saved.' 'Go ye,' said Christ to his apostles, 'and teach all nations, . . . teaching them *to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you*, and lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.' One effect, then, of the work of Christ is, that the Father has been so propitiated thereby, as to place the whole human race as the rebellious subjects of his government, under law to him as mediator,—and to issue among them the gracious proclamation, that whoso cometh unto the Father by him, in the way of confessing and forsaking their sins, shall have mercy.

These effects have, *secondly*, a relation to God in his gracious character as the God of salvation, and to

men as sinners, and obnoxious to his wrath in consequence of their transgressions. God was so propitiated by the sacrifice of the sin-offering, and by the sprinkling of its blood before the vail on ordinary occasions, and on the mercy-seat on the great day of atonement, as to fulfil his promises, and turn away his wrath from the congregation of Israel. When the high priest made atonement by sprinkling the blood of the sin-offering seven times before the Lord, even before the vail for the sins of ignorance, which the congregation of Israel had committed, God said 'it shall be forgiven them.' (Lev. iv. 20.) When the high priest went into the tabernacle of the congregation to make an atonement in the holy place, by sprinkling the blood of the goat, upon which the Lord's lot fell to be the sin-offering, on the mercy-seat, and before the mercy-seat seven times; and when he afterwards presented the goat on which the lot fell to be the scape-goat before the Lord, to make an atonement with him, laying both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confessing over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and then sending him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness, God said, 'The goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited. For on that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord.' (Lev. xvi. 10, 21, 22, 30.)

In like manner, God is so propitiated by the sacrifice of Christ, and by the sprinkling of his blood, as graciously to pardon and accept as righteous in his sight all those who enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by that new and living way which he hath consecrated for us through the vail, that is to say, his flesh, and who draw near him with a true heart, and in full assurance of faith. Another effect, then, of the work of Christ, as of a propitiatory character is, the justification of men, as sinners and in a state of condemnation. This effect, however, does not, like the former one, extend indefinitely to all men, but is restricted to a definite portion of their number,—even to those who *believe*. God hath set forth Christ to the world as a propitiatory covering *through faith* in his blood—that is, exclusively to those who believe on him. God, as the just God, is the justifier of him only who believeth in Jesus, for, according to divine ordination, the Saviour satisfied the claims of justice and law, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

Atonement or reconciliation is an effect of the death of Christ.

The obedience of Christ unto death is spoken of in the scriptures as the means by which *atonement* or *reconciliation* is effected between God and sinners. The work of Christ has a reference to God as angry with men on account of their sins, and to men as enemies in their minds to God, and by wicked works,

and it is the means through which his anger is turned away from his people, and by which the enmity of their hearts towards him is destroyed. It is the means by which both those obstacles to concord and friendship, which arise from the law and justice of God, and by which also those obstacles which arise from the state of their minds towards God, are removed. It is the means by which he and they are thus reconciled to one another. The verb used by the inspired writers of the New Testament scriptures to describe this change is καταλλάσσω, to change, to reconcile, and in our version of these, it is invariably translated to reconcile, as in 1 Cor. vii. 11; 2 Cor. v. 18–20; Rom. v. 10. The noun καταλλαγὴ, derived from this verb, is likewise invariably translated reconciliation, as in Rom. xi. 15; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19. The only exception to this is Rom. v. 11, where it is translated atonement. If the word atonement, used in the translation of this text, were understood to denote the sacrifice of himself which Christ offered up to take away sins, as it is now generally though improperly used by theologians, then such a translation of it would not be scripturally accurate; but if it is used in its etymological meaning, and as the translators of the Old Testament scriptures, in which it frequently occurs, seem always to have understood it, and to denote at-one-ment, even the bringing of parties who are at variance with one another to be at-one, or into a state of reconciliation and friendship, then this trans-

lation is manifestly just and proper, and reveals to us, according to the design of the apostle, one of the blessed effects of Christ's death. To call the sacrifice of Christ the atonement will also appear to be inaccurate language, if we consider that the words used by the Spirit of God to denote that work of the Saviour, are θυσία, sacrifice, (Eph. v. 2; Heb ix. 20,) and προσφορά, offering, (Eph. v. 2; Heb. x. 14,) or ἱλλασμός, when the propitiatory character of that sacrifice and offering is referred to, and not καταλλαγὴ. The Spirit of God never uses the word καταλλαγὴ to denote the sacrifice of Christ, but invariably to denote the reconciliation which is effected between God and sinners by this means. In proof of this we appeal to Rom. xi. 15, and to 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, the only other passages of scripture in which the word occurs, and in all of which it undoubtedly means reconciliation. And we also appeal to the phraseology of the verse itself in which our translators have rendered it atonement. 'We joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have *now* (νῦν, lately or at this present time) received the atonement or reconciliation. That is, we were not actually reconciled to God at the time when Christ died, but after he sent his gospel to us, and brought us to receive him by faith as our Saviour. The words atonement and reconciliation, we therefore conclude, are not descriptive of the nature of Christ's obedience unto death, but of one of the glorious effects which result from that work.

The reconciliation which is effected between God and sinners by means of the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mediator *is mutual.* Sinners are not merely reconciled to God, but God is also reconciled to sinners. When we affirm that God is reconciled to sinners in consequence of Christ's propitiatory offering, we do not mean that his work produced any change whatever in the divine character and purpose, or caused him to be gracious and merciful; for the mercy of God is itself the cause to which both the shedding and sprinkling of the blood of Christ are to be ascribed; but we mean that his work produced a change in the divine dispensation towards them, so that he, in consistency with the holiness of his nature and the laws of his government, truly turns away his anger from every one who believes in Jesus, and says to him, as he did to Israel of old, 'I am pacified toward thee for all that thou hast done.' (Ezek. xvi. 63.) 'It is objected,' says Dr Dick, 'that it is nowhere said that God was reconciled to us, but that we are reconciled to him; and such a reconciliation does not signify the averting of his anger against us, but the laying aside of our enmity against him. We may ask those who advance the objection, whether they believe that God was not offended at the sins of men? If they say that he was not, they give the lie to innumerable passages, in which his abhorrence of sin and his determination to punish the sinner are declared, and they virtually maintain that holiness

and justice are not perfections of his nature. If they admit that sin is displeasing to him, and vengeance is proclaimed against the sinner, they must also admit that not only are we reconciled to God, but he is reconciled to us—that having been once angry, he is now pacified. Whether they will allow that this change was effected by the death of Christ or not, they can neither deny that it does take place and is owing to some cause, nor object to the idea itself with any appearance of reason. He who once threatened to punish another, but has since pardoned him and now treats him with kindness, has certainly been reconciled to him. If his sentiments towards him were always the same, his appearances of displeasure were a dramatic show inconsistent with sincerity. The argument that God is not said in express terms to have been reconciled to us, is of no weight while his reconciliation is implied in other phrases, as that he hath made peace by the blood of his cross, and reconciled those who once were alienated and enemies in their mind by wicked works; and that Christ is a propitiation for sin, or has made God propitious to us, with whom, on account of sin, he was formerly displeased. The objectors have been misled by not attending to the true import of καταλλασσεσθαι, and διαλλαττεσθαι, which is also used in the New Testament. Such words are employed in the classics to signify the removing of the anger of the gods, and bear the same sense in the sacred writings. They signify to return

to a state of peace with a person whom we had offended, to pacify him and render him friendly. Thus when our Lord says in the gospel of Matthew, "If thy brother has aught against thee," has some ground of offence, "go and διαλλαγηθι τῳ αδελφῳ σου, be reconciled to thy brother," nothing can be plainer than that the offender is not exhorted to lay aside his enmity to his brother, although this is understood, and that the purpose of going to the offended person is to reconcile him by confession and reparation—to appease his anger and persuade him to be at peace with the offender. Here, then, the phrase, "be reconciled to another," signifies to reconcile the other to us; and why should not the word have the same meaning when it is used in reference to God? We are reconciled to him, as we are reconciled to our injured brother. Something is done which disposes him to receive us into favour. Now, the cause of reconciliation which the scripture assigns is the death of Christ, and consequently his death was a propitiatory sacrifice. The apostle explains our being saved from wrath by "our receiving the reconciliation." (Rom. v. 9, 11.) To receive the reconciliation is to obtain the remission of our sins; but to receive our conversion, which is the sense of Socinians, is a form of speech altogether unprecedented. The two reconciliations, of God to sinners and of sinners to God, are mentioned in the fifth chapter of the second epistle to the Corinthians. Of the first the apostle says, "God was in Christ

reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." Thus reconciliation consisted in forgiving them; that is, in ceasing to be angry with them, and receiving them into favour; and how it was effected, we learn, in general, from the mention of Christ as a person by whom the world was reconciled, and in particular from the words subjoined for explanation: "For he made him to be sin," or "a sin-offering for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." This reconciliation was evidently on the part of God, who, by the mediation of Christ, opened the way for the exercise of his mercy in pardoning the guilty. It cannot mean our personal reconciliation to God, or our conversion; for this follows as a consequence of the former. On the grounds of God's reconciliation to us, we are exhorted to be reconciled to him, and the great motive or encouragement is his previous reconciliation: "He hath committed to us the ministry of reconciliation. Now then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled unto God." Since God has given Christ to be a propitiation for sin, and has sent us to proclaim the joyful tidings, do you accept the offer of peace, and enter into covenant with him. We are reconciled to God when we are justified by faith.' — (Dr Dick's Lectures on Theology, lect. 58.)

The At-one-ment, viewed in reference to our personal

reconciliation to God, is not identical with pardon, but the consequence of it.

The pardon of our sins is the primary effect of the propitiatory work of Christ, whereas our reconciliation to God is a secondary effect thereof, and one which immediately results from the enjoyment of that blessing. In proof of this, we appeal to the nature of the typical services of the Levitical dispensation. When the whole congregation of Israel sinned through ignorance, the elders of the congregation were to lay their hands on the head of the sin-offering, and the priest was to sprinkle some of its blood seven times before the Lord, even before the vail, putting some of its blood also on the horns of the altar of incense; it is added, And the priest וְכִפֶּר shall make a propitiatory covering (Sept., ἐξιλάσεται, shall make propitiation) for them; and the consequence of this propitiatory covering of their transgressions is, 'it shall be forgiven them.' (Lev. iv. 13–20.) The whole of the transactions narrated in this passage have obviously a reference to the congregation of Israel as sinners against God, and therefore obnoxious to his wrath. In it God taught them how they were to seek his pardoning mercy and deliverance from punishment, and promised them forgiveness through the blood of a sin-offering sprinkled before and on his throne, as a propitiatory covering of their transgressions. Forgiveness is plainly the *primary* idea expressed in the passage, and atonement or reconciliation the *secondary* one; for how could they

be brought into a state of concord with God until their sins, which separated them from him, were forgiven?

This view of the subject is further established by the account which is given of the nature and ends of that work which the Jewish high priest performed on the great day of atonement. He was 'to make an atonement (לְכַפֵּר to make a propitiatory covering; Sept., ἐξιλάσκεσθαι, to make propitiation) for all the children of Israel *for all their sins* once a year,' (Lev. xvi. 34,) that they might be clean *from all their sins* before the Lord, (ver. 30.) It is evident, from this passage, that the work of the high priest on the great day of atonement had a direct and primary reference to the children of Israel as sinners against God, and was to be performed by him as the appointed means of obtaining the forgiveness of their sins and purification from its pollution, and consequently, that its reference to them, as enemies to God, and their atonement or reconciliation to him, as one of its effects, is of a secondary and accessory character. Besides, the verb כִּפֶּר does not radically mean to make atonement or reconciliation, but to cover, to remove from sight; and as used in regard to sin, to cover it—to pardon it. It is a word that frequently occurs in the books of Moses, and which our translators have generally rendered to make atonement, and sometimes to reconcile, to make reconciliation, as in Lev. vi. 30; viii. 15; xvi. 20. In translating the same word to make

atonement, and sometimes to make reconciliation, it appears that they used the word atonement in its etymological sense—as synonymous with reconciliation; but in giving it this translation, they do not bring out, as ought to have been done, the primary and principal idea of the expiation of sin, which the word denotes, and of which atonement or reconciliation is only a secondary consequence. The mind of the Spirit of God, we submit, would have been more clearly expressed, if they had invariably rendered it, to expiate, to propitiate, or to make a propitiatory covering; that is, of transgression as the means of pardon. The Seventy, so far as we have examined the subject, never use καταλλάσσω, to reconcile, in translating כִּפֶּר, but generally ἐξιλάομαι, to propitiate, to expiate. And they call the tenth day of the seventh month ἡμέρα ἐξιλασμοῦ (Lev. xxiii. 27, 28),—ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ, the day of the propitiation. (Lev. xxv. 9.) They indeed, in translating it, sometimes use the verb ἁγιάζω, to make clean or holy, as in Ex. xxix. 33, 36, and καθαρίζω, to cleanse, as in Ex. xxix. 37; xxx. 10; but as the first of these verbs answers to קִדֵּשׁ and the second to טִהֵר, and neither of them to כִּפֶּר—as pardon was to the believing worshipper the primary effect of the sprinkling of the blood of the sin-offering before the Lord; and as holiness, like atonement, was consequent on the forgiveness of his sins—it would have been more accurate if they had also used the verb ἐξιλάομαι in the translation of these and similar passages.

In further proof that atonement, or reconciliation, is not identical with pardon, but a consequence of it, we appeal to the words of the apostle Paul, when he says that 'God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation; . . . for he hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin.' (2 Cor. v. 19, 21.) In this passage he obviously represents pardon, according to the analogical revelation of it in the types of the Mosaic law, as a blessing to be obtained through Christ, who was made a sin-offering for us, and our reconciliation to God as distinct from that blessing—even as a consequence of God's not imputing our trespasses unto us, and of our faith in his testimony as the word of reconciliation. In proof of the same view of the subject, we also appeal to his words when he says, 'Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.' (Rom. v. 1.) In this text the justification of sinners by faith, which confessedly includes the forgiveness of sin, is represented as an effect of the propitiatory work of Christ antecedent to their reconciliation, or enjoyment of peace with God. From both of these passages, therefore, we conclude that atonement, or reconciliation, is not identical with pardon, but a consequence of it.

On the whole here, if the word καταλλαγή, atonement, or reconciliation, is never used in the scriptures to denote either Christ's death, as the sacrifice

by whose blood propitiation was made, or pardon, the primary effect of his propitiatory work; but to denote the consequences of forgiveness, even the turning away of God's anger from sinners, so as not to inflict punishment upon them for their iniquities, and the removal of the enmity that is in their hearts towards God; and if all men are not pardoned, and therefore not reconciled to God, or brought into a state of oneness or agreement with him; then it must evidently be inaccurate to speak of universal atonement. Atonement consists in two things: in the turning away of God's anger from sinners, as the result of his not imputing unto them their trespasses, and in the removal of that enmity that is in their hearts towards God. Where these objects are not effected there is no atonement. To admit that these blessings are enjoyed only by a definite number of our race, and yet to assert that atonement is universal, is to affirm a contradictory proposition.

It would, we are persuaded, tend greatly to accuracy of thought and propriety of language, if all theologians, in speaking of the nature of the mediatorial work of the Saviour, were to restrict themselves to the terms which the Spirit of God employs on this subject, such as, an offering and a sacrifice for sin, the propitiation, a ransom or price, righteousness, and the work given him to do; and if they were also, in speaking of its effects, to restrict themselves to the terms which he employs on this department of the subject,

such as a propitiatory covering, atonement or reconciliation, redemption or deliverance, sanctification or holiness, and salvation or everlasting life; and if they were invariably to use these terms in the scriptural acceptation of them. The views of many which are apparently conflicting would often be found to be in harmony if this simple rule were attended to.

Redemption an effect of the death of Christ.

The obedience of Christ unto death is spoken of in the scriptures as the means by which sinners obtain *redemption* from the dominion of sin and of Satan, and from the punishment which they deserve on account of their transgressions. Men are the slaves of sin and of Satan, and are also in a state of condemnation and under the sentence of death. Now, the character and work of Christ have a reference to them as in this miserable condition. Jesus died and lives and reigns to save his people from their sins, and to deliver them from the wrath to come. He is the Redeemer of Israel. The work of Christ, however, in actually delivering sinners from the bondage of sin, and from the curse of the law, ought not to be confounded with his work in giving his life for the attainment of these ends. The former is the *redemption* or actual deliverance of his people, the latter is the *price* of their redemption. This distinction is not only obvious from the very nature of these works, but also from the terms which the Spirit of God employs in describing them respectively. These terms are Λύτρωσις or ἀπολύτρωσις, redemption, de-

liverance; and λύτρον or ἀντίλυτρον, ransom. The former refers to the work of Christ in the administration of the covenant of grace, and describes the redemption which he effects by his almighty power in all who are saved, as in its nature a deliverance from the service of sin, from its penalty, and from the dominion of Satan. The latter refers to the work of Christ in fulfilling the condition of the covenant, and represents his obedience unto death, as in its nature the price of this redemption. Further, these differ in this, that the ransom was paid at the fulness of time, when Christ laid down his life for our salvation; whereas redemption is accomplished in the day of effectual calling, when sinners are actually turned from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, and invested with the liberty wherewith Christ makes his people free. And these also differ in this, that the payment of the ransom was completed in the hour when Christ said, It is finished, and bowed his head, and gave up the ghost; whereas the redemption of believers is not completed in regard to their souls until the hour of death, and in regard to their bodies until the resurrection at the last day. The 'sons of God,' whether on earth or in heaven, are 'waiting for the adoption, to wit (τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν) the redemption of their bodies.'

In proof of the distinction between redemption and the ransom that Christ gave for it, and that the former is an effect of the latter, we appeal to the words of the

apostle Paul, when he says, 'The Father hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son, in whom we have redemption through his blood, (*τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ του ἄιματος ἀυτοῦ*) even the forgiveness of sins.' (Col. i. 13, 14.) This passage plainly teaches us that the redemption of believers consists in the forgiveness of sins, in deliverance from the power of darkness—from the power exerted over them in that dark empire over which Satan rules, and in their translation into the kingdom of his dear Son, and also that it is different from the death of Christ; for this is specified as the means through which it is communicated and enjoyed. 'We have redemption *through his blood.*' In further proof of the distinction between redemption and the price paid for it, we also appeal to the words of the apostle Peter: 'Ye know that ye were not redeemed (*ἐλυτρώθητε*) with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.' (1 Pet. i. 18, 19.) In this passage redemption is also obviously spoken of as something different from the price paid for it. It consists in the actual deliverance of sinners, in the day of effectual calling, (ver. 15,) from their vain conversation, that is, from the profitless service of sin, to holiness and to the worship of the true God, which Christ at the fulness of time secured for believers by the price of his precious blood, or by that compensa-

tion to the justice and law of God which the Redeemer made, when he gave his life for their life. From these and similar passages of scripture, we therefore conclude, that sinners, viewed as the slaves of sin and Satan, and as under the sentence of death on account of their transgressions, obtain redemption from this degraded and miserable condition through the mediatorial work of the Saviour, and that this deliverance is one of the blessed fruits of his death. Redemption is not the ransom, but an effect resulting from the payment of the ransom.

Regeneration and Sanctification effects of the death of Christ.

The obedience of Christ unto death is spoken of in the scriptures as the means through which sinners obtain the blessing of *sanctification*, and are made personally holy. All men, as fallen and sinful beings, are not merely under the curse of the law and deserving of punishment, but they are also in a state of depravity, and do all invariably sin against God in thought, in desire, and in action. Now the death of Christ has a reference to the condition of man in this aspect of it. It is not only the means by which we receive the forgiveness of sin and deliverance from hell, but by which also we are consecrated to the service of God, and made holy and fitted for heaven. If it is the design of God in the purpose of mercy to make his people perfectly holy,—if he predestinated them to be conformed to the image of his Son,—if he

hath chosen them in him before the foundation of the world, that they should be holy and without blame before him in love,—and if the ends which the Son of God has in view, in the work that he performs as mediator, are ever in harmony with those of the other persons of the Godhead, which none can deny; then does it not follow that the Saviour must have given obedience unto death, for the accomplishment of this end of the purpose of mercy, and with the intention of making his people perfect in holiness? The truth of this conclusion is established by his personal testimony. 'For their sakes,' says he, 'I sanctify myself,' (ἐγὼ ἁγιάζω ἐμαυτὸν, I consecrate or devote myself; compare with chap. x. 36; that is, to do the will of my Father, and to lay down my life in obedience to the commandment which I have received from him,) 'that they also might be sanctified through the truth,' (ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ὦσιν ἡγιασμένοι, to the end that they also might be consecrated; that is, to do the will of God through the truth, in consequence of my death.) And it is also established by the testimony which the Holy Spirit hath given us in the writings of inspired men. 'Jesus Christ,' says Paul, 'gave himself for us that (ἵνα to the end that) he might redeem us from all iniquity, (καὶ καθαρίσῃ) and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works.' (Tit. ii. 14.) And again he says, 'Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it, (ἵνα αὐτὴν ἁγιάσῃ καθαρίσας, to the end that he might consecrate

it to the service of God, having cleansed it,) with the washing of water by the word, that (*ινα* to the end that) he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish.' (Eph. v. 26, 27.) Do not these texts prove beyond contradiction that one design of the Saviour, in giving obedience unto death, was to make his people perfectly holy?

The blessing of sanctification, which Christ died to secure for his people, consists in the complete transformation of their whole man into his own image. In regard to the soul, it consists in the mortification of its corrupt propensities,—in turning from all sin to God,—and in having thoughts, desires, volitions, and actions, in conformity to the divine nature and law. And in regard to the body, it consists in 'not yielding our members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin, but in yielding ourselves unto God as those that are alive from the dead, and our members as instruments of righteousness unto God.' Sanctification has not, like justification, a relation to our state as under the condemnation of the law, but a relation to our character as corrupt and sinful beings and unfit for the kingdom of heaven. In justification we are made righteous in regard to all the demands that law and justice have upon us, through the righteousness of Immanuel imputed to us, and thus obtain deliverance from the wrath to come; whereas in sancti-

fication we are made personally righteous through the regenerating and purifying influences of the Holy Spirit, and are thus 'made meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light.' The sanctification of sinners commences in the day of regeneration, when they are actually united to Christ, and become spiritually alive—when they are made the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. It is carried on and increased throughout the period of their existence on earth, and is perfected in regard to their souls at the hour of death, and in regard to their bodies in the resurrection of the last day.

This change is produced by the agency of the Holy Ghost, through the instrumentality of the word, the ordinances, and providences of God, in connection with the agency of sinners themselves, in observing and improving these means of salvation. In proof of the truth of these statements, we might refer to many texts of scripture, but let the following suffice for this purpose: 'I will sprinkle clean water upon you,' saith the Lord: 'and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them. . . . Thus saith the Lord God, I will yet for this be inquired of

by the house of Israel, to do it for them.' (Ezek. xxxvi. 25–27, 37.) The blessing that God promises us in this passage is regeneration or sanctification. These do not differ from each other, but are essentially one and the same blessing; for regeneration means simply the commencement of that change from sin to holiness which constitutes sanctification. And God presents this blessing to our view in the various clauses of the passage in reference to its nature,—its necessity,—the agency by which it is effected,—the cause to which it is to be ascribed,—the means by which it is realised,—and the evidences by which it is manifested.

But passing over these things, it is sufficient for our present purpose to observe, that sanctification is one of the effects of Christ's sacrificial death. Like reconciliation and redemption, it is an effect of a secondary character. The primary and proper effect of the death of Christ, as an expiatory sacrifice, as we have already seen, was to propitiate God by satisfying the claims of his violated law, so that he could, in consistency with his justice and the immutable principles of his government, pardon the guilty. So long as the guilt of sin, and the curse of the law, which stands necessarily connected with it, were not removed, these formed insuperable obstacles to the mission of the Holy Spirit to purify our hearts by faith. 'The strength of sin,' says an apostle, 'is the law;' that is, the law has power to keep men in that state of

bondage to sin and Satan, and of condemnation, into which they have brought themselves by transgression, unless its claims are fully satisfied. But when the Saviour satisfied all the demands of the law by becoming obedient unto death, he then removed those legal obstacles which prevented the salvation of man, and thus opened up a way by which the Father, according to the arrangements of the covenant of grace, might, in consistency with the principles of equity, and in answer to the intercessory prayer of Christ, send forth the Holy Spirit to abide in the church for ever, and to sanctify every sinner who sought this blessing in his name, and for the sake of his righteousness. Hence the scriptures clearly teach us that the blood of Christ is the means by which sinners are sanctified, and through which the Spirit imparts his influences to meeten them for the kingdom of heaven. 'The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin. He saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly *through Jesus Christ our Saviour*.'

If then the work of Christ is the ground on which 'we have received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost,' and on which that promise is fulfilled, and if sinners are sanctified by the Spirit only through the blood of Christ, does it not evidently follow that the blessing of sanctification is one of the effects of his propitiatory sacrifice? The

Spirit could not have been given if Jesus had not been crucified and glorified. And further, if Christ died that sinners may be made holy, does it not also follow, that all who believe on him will be careful to maintain good works, and to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world? The antinomian theory, 'that the moral law is not a rule of conduct to believers,' is flagrantly inconsistent with the very nature of that law, as founded on the relations which God sustains to men as their Creator and Lord, and which they sustain to him as his creatures and the subjects of his government, and as therefore immutable in its character—it impiously sets aside those obligations which rest on men, in every condition of their being, to obey its precepts —it dishonours Christ and his work, who died, and lives, and reigns to save his people from their sins, and to deliver them out of the hand of their enemies, that they might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him all the days of their life—and it overlooks and contemns all those means for sanctifying the soul which he has provided in the scriptures, and in the ordinances of his grace, and which he employs and blesses, 'that the man of God may be perfect, and throughly furnished unto all good works.' 'Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law.'

Eternal life an effect of the death of Christ.

Lastly, the obedience of Christ unto death is spoken of in the scriptures as the means through which sinners obtain the blessing of *eternal life*. Eternal life consists in the never-ending enjoyment of perfect holiness and of perfect happiness in the kingdom of heaven. It is the all-inclusive gift of God to his people. It comprehends all the blessings they need —all they can desire—all they can enjoy, as sinful, rational and immortal beings. Eternal life is the sum of salvation. This blessing is not simply life—life in the favour of God—life in conformity to the image of his Son—and life in fellowship with him and all holy beings in the kingdom of heaven; but it is eternal life. This is its ineffable and crowning glory. And this life, unlike that life of holiness and happiness which man enjoyed in Eden, can never be lost. No, its perpetuity is infallibly secured by the necessary, immutable, and eternal existence of the Mediator himself. 'Because I live,' says Jesus, 'ye shall live also.' Now the scriptures teach us that this unspeakable blessing of eternal life is one of the effects of Christ's sacrificial death: 'This is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, *and this life is in his Son.*' (1 John v. 11.) And again, 'The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.' (Rom. vi. 23.) And further, the scriptures teach us that this gift of eternal life is not to be enjoyed by all men, but only by those who believingly and gratefully accept of it: 'He that

believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.' (John iii. 36.)

On the whole then, if, as we have shown, the pardon of sin, atonement or reconciliation, redemption, sanctification, and eternal life, are the blessed and glorious effects which result from the propitiatory sacrifice of the Saviour, and if he died that every one of our race who come to him should receive these blessings, are we not warranted to conclude that his obedience unto death was absolutely perfect, and that it accomplished all the ends for which it was given? If it were otherwise, how could the Redeemer save his people from their sins; and how could he at the last day present them to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, and say to his Father, amid the acclamations of angels and the hosannas of his redeemed, 'Behold I and the children which thou hast given me'? If Christ's work were not perfect, 'our faith is vain; we are yet in our sins: then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished.' But blessed be God, his work is perfect, and therefore none perish who trust in him.

3. That the work of our Lord Jesus Christ, in giving obedience to the law of God, and in suffering death, the curse of the law, was absolutely perfect, is evident *from the fact that intelligent beings of every order in the universe have borne witness to the truth of this doctrine.*

The perfection of Christ's obedience unto death is proved by the testimony of the Father, the first person of the Godhead. At his baptism, says an evangelist, 'Lo a voice from heaven was heard saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.' On the mount of transfiguration the Father again announced, in the hearing of Peter and James and John, his approbation of the mediatorial character and work of his well-beloved Son: 'Behold a bright cloud overshadowed them, and behold a voice out of the cloud which said, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased: hear ye him.' And a third time, when the Saviour prayed, saying, 'Now is my soul troubled. Father, save me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify thy name. Then came there a voice from heaven, saying, I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again.' Moreover, did not the Father raise him from the dead, and give him glory, in testimony to men that his sacrifice was 'of a sweet smelling savour?' And did not the Saviour 'receive of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost,' and give him to the church at Pentecost in a more eminent degree than he had been given during the Old Testament dispensation, in testimony that the condition on which her enjoyment of his gracious presence and saving influences depended, had been fulfilled to the entire satisfaction of the Father?

The perfection of Christ's obedience unto death is

proved by the testimony of the Son of God himself, 'I am one,' says he, 'that bear witness of myself, and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me.' The testimony that he gives concerning himself is summarily contained in the following texts:—To the unbelieving Jews he said, 'Which of you convinceth me of sin? and if I say the truth, why do ye not believe me?' To his disciples he said, 'The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me; but that the world may know that I love the Father, and as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do.' To the Father he said, 'I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do.' And on the cross he said to intelligent beings of every order throughout the universe, 'It is finished.' Does not the Saviour in these texts defy his enemies to point to any thing wrong in his character and life, and does he not unequivocally affirm that the obedience which he gave to God for us was given in that exact and perfect degree which the law demanded, and that he thereby fully accomplished the work which the Father gave him to do?

The perfection of Christ's propitiatory work is also proved by the testimony of the Holy Spirit. 'When the Comforter is come,' says Christ, 'whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me.' And says the apostle Peter, 'Him hath God exalted with his right hand, to be a Prince

and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins; and we are his witnesses of these things, and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him.' The testimony which he gives concerning Christ is contained in those scriptures which holy men of God wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; and the apostle John states the sum of it when he says, 'These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name.'

The perfection of Christ's obedience unto death is proved by the testimony of the holy angels. Did not an angel announce the incarnation of the Son of God to the shepherds of Bethlehem when he said unto them, 'Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord'? And did not the multitude of the heavenly host who were with the angel foretell the perfection of that obedience unto death which he was to give in the human nature for the salvation of sinners, when they praised God on account of its glorious results, 'singing glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, and good-will toward men?' And did not an angel attest the perfection of his obedience after he had finished it, when he said to Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, at the empty sepulchre of Jesus, 'He is not here; for

he is risen as he said. Come see the place where the Lord lay?'

The perfection of Christ's propitiatory sacrifice is proved by the testimony of his apostles. The Lord Jesus said to his apostles immediately before he ascended to heaven, 'Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you, and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.' Hence all the apostles and evangelists unite in bearing testimony to the holiness of Christ's character and the perfection of his work. 'We,' they say, 'are his witnesses of these things.' The apostle Peter testifies of Christ, saying, 'He did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously: who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye are healed.' John, the beloved disciple, bears witness to the same truths, saying, 'He was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin.' Paul, the great apostle of the Gentiles, also affirms 'that God made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.' Indeed, 'to him gave all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.'

Finally, the perfection of the Saviour's obedience unto

death is proved by the testimony of his enemies. Did not Judas, who betrayed him, when he saw that he was condemned, repent and bring again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders, which he had received of them as the price of his treachery, and say, 'I have sinned, in that I have betrayed the innocent blood?' Did not Pilate, the pusillanimous judge who condemned him, repeatedly say to the Jews, 'I find no fault in him?' and when he saw them bent on his crucifixion, and that he could prevail nothing, but that rather a tumult was made, did he not take water, and wash his hands before the multitude, and say, 'I am innocent of the blood of this just person; see ye to it?' Nay, did not the very spirits of darkness themselves give testimony to the perfection of Christ's character and work, saying, 'Let us alone; what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art; the Holy One of God.'

Can any man reflect on the testimony which all orders of intelligent beings have thus given concerning the Saviour, and not be fully persuaded of the spotless holiness of his character, and of the absolute perfection of the work that he performed, in becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the cross?

IV. *The value of the work of Christ.*

The work of Christ, in giving obedience unto death for the salvation of sinners, is a work of infinite value.

The value of Christ's obedience does not, like its efficacy, depend on divine appointment; but on the nature of the work itself. There is such a moral congruity between means and ends under the government of God, as that the efficacy of the means which he employs for the accomplishment of any end does not depend on mere appointment; but also on the nature and character of these means themselves, as suitable to the end in view, and fitted to effectuate it. Divine appointment is indeed necessary to establish a connection between means and ends, and to impart efficacy to the former for the attainment of the latter; but it can never alter the nature of things, and render that valuable as a means to an end which is naturally worthless and ineffective. Hence says an apostle, 'It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.' But if the blood of these animals was appointed by God to be shed in his worship, and if the value of their blood were to depend simply on divine appointment, and not on the nature of the thing itself, whence this impossibility? In consistency with these principles, we therefore conclude, that the infinite value of Christ's obedience unto death does not arise from divine appointment, but from the very nature of that work itself; and that its intrinsic worth is the ground on which it is appointed by God, as the means of human salvation, and rendered efficacious for the attainment of this end.

Now, if the infinite value of the obedience of Christ is not founded on divine appointment, but on the nature of that work, what are those things in its nature in which its infinite value consists? In reply to this question we observe :—

1. That the *value* of the obedience of Christ consists in its absolute perfection. The perfection of his obedience includes two things—(1.) Its exact and invariable agreement with the will of God. Being made under the law, as mediator he always maintained and manifested the holiness of his character, by giving obedience unto all its precepts, and by suffering death, the curse of the law. He fulfilled all righteousness. (2.) Its voluntary character. Moral obedience being the homage of the mind and heart to God, can never be compulsory. To say that any moral agent obeys God, and yet does so unwillingly, is to affirm a contradictory proposition. If the Saviour, therefore, gave perfect obedience unto God, it follows, from the nature of things, that in obeying the precepts of the law, and in suffering its curse, he acted voluntarily. Hence he says, 'I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart;' and again, 'No man taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of myself.' Now the perfection of the obedience of Christ, including as this does its exact agreement with the will of God and its voluntary character, is the very thing in which its value consists. Nothing more was necessary to illustrate the holiness of God in the salvation of sinners,

and to maintain the efficiency of his moral government throughout the universe, than that the Mediator between God and men should give perfect obedience to the law which they had dishonoured, and fully endure the penalty they had incurred. But the Saviour has accomplished this work in both these departments of it, and he hath done it in perfection. Hence it is described in the scriptures as 'righteousness,' and as 'the righteousness of God.' Nothing less than this was needed for the justification of one sinner, and nothing more in the nature of things could have been required though all were to have been saved; for no addition can be made to that which is perfect. The Lord Jesus Christ, therefore, in his obedience unto death, as in its very nature perfect, is a precious and sure foundation on which every sinner should, with unwavering confidence, erect the pillar of his hopes for acceptance in the sight of God and a blessed immortality. For the scripture saith, 'Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.'

2. The *infinite* value of the obedience of Christ is founded on the dignity of his person. The Lord Jesus Christ, who became obedient unto death for the salvation of sinners, is the second person of the Godhead—'God manifest in the flesh.' It is true that he obeyed and suffered merely in the human nature. As that nature, however, had no distinct personality, being simply united to his person as God, it follows that all he did and suffered in the human nature must have,

in virtue of this connection, a value relatively infinite, and must be ascribed to his agency as a divine person. Hence it is said that 'the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ gave himself for us,' and that he 'who was in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God, became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.' If, then, according to these and many other texts of scripture, the work which the Saviour performed in becoming obedient unto death, is ascribed to his personal agency as the Word made flesh; if it is never ascribed to him simply as a man, but invariably as Immanuel, God with us, and as the man Jehovah's fellow; are we not therefore warranted to conclude, that the value of his obedience unto death must be truly infinite? 'A person only,' says Dr W. Symington, 'can perform moral acts: The human nature of Christ possessed no personal subsistence; but the human nature of Christ alone could either suffer or obey, although the obedience and sufferings of his humanity, viewed in themselves, could have no moral character. To give them a moral character they must be viewed in connection with his person; whence it follows, that the obedience and sufferings of Christ, *physically* considered, possessed only the worth of humanity, but *morally* considered they possessed a worth proportioned to the dignity of his divine person. Now, as the sufferings and death of Christ for the sins of his people were of a moral character, being endured with a view to meet the claims of the divine moral

government, to satisfy the law and justice of God, it follows that there is attached to them all the value which divine dignity could impart.'—(Dr W. Symington on the Atonement, p. 214.)

The deity of Christ, however, is not merely the principle on which the infinite value of his obedience depends, but it is also the ground on which his obedience, in conformity with the laws of equity, can be placed to the account of those whom he represented. No angel, not all the angels of heaven, however exalted in the scale of being, could obey the law of God, or suffer death, its penalty, for our redemption, because obedience in every condition of their existence is necessarily due to God on their own account, and because their life is not their own property or at their own disposal. But the Saviour as a divine person is not necessarily under law to God like created beings, and his obedience to the law, in consequence of his voluntary consent to be placed under its obligations for our redemption, is therefore righteously imputable unto us. Having taken the human nature into union with his person, his life in that nature is his own property and at his own disposal. He has power to lay it down in our room, and power to take it again.

Thus the deity of the Saviour is the principle that imparts to his obedience unto death its infinite value, and that also renders it imputable to sinners as the ground of their justification before God. Yes, the divinity of Christ is that which stamps the image and

superscription of God on his cross, and to which its infinite worth and ineffable glories are all to be ascribed. Deny the deity of the Saviour, and you let down the dignity of his work to the level of humanity—you subvert the scriptural theory of the imputation of his righteousness for the justification of the ungodly—you annul the sacrificial and propitiatory character of his death—you despoil the gospel of its invaluable riches and of all its saving blessings, and you leave nothing on which sinful and lost man can fix his confidence and hopes for a blessed immortality. Deny the deity of the Saviour, and you undermine the very foundation on which the temple of the living God is built. If Christ were not God, then he did not die for our salvation according to the scriptures; then is the preaching of the cross vain, and our faith is also vain, and all men are yet in their sins.

Theologians, generally, in accounting for the value of Christ's sacrificial death, include other elements besides those which we have specified. 'Relationship of nature to those for whom the atonement was made,' says Dr W. Symington, 'is an essential element in its validity.'—(Symington on the Atonement, p. 217.) This, however, as it appears to us, is not strictly accurate. Relationship of nature designates the class of beings for whom a Saviour is provided, and gives that class a beneficiary interest in his work; but it neither determines nor describes the nature of the work that is necessary to be done for their salva-

tion. This is exclusively determined and regulated by the justice of God, or those principles of equity by which he governs the moral universe, and would have been essentially the same, whether sinning angels or sinning men were to have been the objects of redeeming love. If, for example, the Son of God had taken upon him the nature of the fallen angels, with the intention of saving them, would he not have been under the necessity, from the holiness of God and the claims of his violated law, to perform essentially the same work for this class of sinners as he has done for sinners of the human race,—to give perfect obedience to the law of God which they had broken, and to suffer the penalty they had incurred? And would not his obedience and sufferings, as a divine person in the angelic nature, have been equally valuable as that which he has given and those he has endured in the human nature? On these principles, therefore, we submit that the relationship of nature which the Redeemer sustains to his people falls under the category of the efficacy of his work as the ordained means of their salvation, and not under that of its nature or intrinsic sufficiency.

The same respected author further says, 'In a compensatory arrangement, such as the atonement is, both parties must be voluntary. Not only must the one party be willing to make the compensation—the other must be willing to accept of it when made. *The appointment of the Father* is no less important than

the voluntary engagement of the Son; and this, we have now to state, is a prerequisite to validity which the work of Christ distinctly possessed.'—(Symington on the Atonement, p. 231.) It is true that, without the appointment of the Mediator by the Father, and the engagement of the Son to do those things in the human nature which justice required to be done for the salvation of men, and that without the promise of the Father to accept of his obedience as the condition of their salvation, the obedience of Christ, however valuable in itself, would have been of no avail as a means to this end; but these things, we submit, belong also to the efficacy of his work, and not to its intrinsic worth. There is a manifest distinction between the sufficiency and the efficiency of Christ's propitiatory death, and unless this is attended to, our conceptions and language respecting it will necessarily be confused and incorrect. By the sufficiency of Christ's obedience unto death we understand its intrinsic excellence, or infinite value, as viewed apart from the ends to which it is subservient; and by its efficacy we understand its power as a means to secure the accomplishment of these ends, in consequence of sovereign appointment and divine influence. The former refers to the nature of Christ's work in relation to the law of God and the claims of justice; the latter refers to that work in relation to the persons for whom it was performed, and to the ends that were to be effected by it. Though, however, these things

are distinct, yet they are inseparably related to each other, according to the connection which God has established between means and ends in this, as in every other department of his administration.

The sufficiency and efficacy of the obedience of Christ differ also in the causes to which they are severally to be ascribed. The sufficiency of Christ's work is not to be attributed to the sovereignty, but to the justice of God. It is the holiness of God, the claims of his law, and the principles of equity on which his government is founded and administered, which demand righteousness or perfect obedience unto death from the Mediator, as the ground of the sinner's justification unto life; whereas the efficacy of Christ's propitiatory work is not to be attributed to the justice, but to the sovereignty of God. God, in the exercise of his sovereign goodness, has an unquestionable right either to provide a Saviour for sinners, or to leave them to perish in their sins; and having graciously provided salvation for them, he has also a right to bestow this blessing, which no sinner has a claim to in equity, on such terms and on such numbers of our race as seemeth good in his sight. It is divine justice that demands a perfect righteousness as the ground of man's salvation, and which, therefore, determines the nature of Christ's work; but it is sovereignty that determines the ends, and that imparts efficacy to his righteousness as the means of their accomplishment. Now, if all the elements which enter into the suffi-

ciency or infinite value of Christ's obedience are determined by the justice of God, and if the appointment of the Mediator by the Father, and the engagement of the Son to do the things that were necessary for the salvation of sinners, and the promise of the Father to accept of his obedience as the condition of their salvation, are to be attributed, not to the equity, but to the sovereignty of God, then it follows that these things are not included in the intrinsic sufficiency or infinite value of that obedience, but in its efficacy as the legal and appointed ground of human salvation.

V.—*The efficacy of the work of Christ.*

The Mediator, in doing and suffering the things that were necessary to fulfil the condition of the covenant of grace, acted from design,—to secure the accomplishment of all the ends of the purpose of mercy. He gave himself for us as the fit and ordained means of accomplishing the ends of that purpose, whether these relate to God, to angels good and evil, or to man. We have already stated, in the preceding chapter, what these ends were, and now observe that the Lord Jesus Christ died with the intention to secure, and did thereby, in reality, secure the accomplishment of all of them, without exception. Was it the design of God, in the purpose of mercy, to illustrate the infinite glory of his nature and perfections, and those immutable principles of equity and of sovereign goodness by which he governs his intelligent

offspring? Christ accomplished this end. 'I have glorified thee on the earth,' says he; 'I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do.' Was it the design of God, in the purpose of mercy, to bruise the head of the serpent, as the head of government over fallen man? Christ accomplished this end. 'Through death, he destroyed him that had the power of death, that is the devil, and delivered them, who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage.' Was it the design of God, in the purpose of mercy, to instruct and bless the holy angels, by giving them more extensive revelations of his glory than they had hitherto received? Christ accomplished this end. He gave himself for us, 'to the intent that now, unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places, might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.' But we pass over these things, and proceed to consider the ends in regard to the human race which God in the purpose of mercy designed to accomplish, and which he effectuates in the execution of that purpose.

These, as we have shown in the preceding chapter, are in general two, namely, 1st. To establish the mediatorial form of government amongst mankind, and to promulgate the law of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, as the rule by which the conduct of all men ought to be regulated; and, 2dly, To save a definite number of the race from sin and misery, and to bring

them eventually to glory by Christ Jesus. And now we shall endeavour to prove that the Saviour has accomplished both of these ends of the mediatorial dispensation by means of his propitiatory death; or in other words, that his death was *efficacious* as a means to ends, and has actually produced the effects that he intended in regard to man.

I. *The Lord Jesus Christ, by means of his obedience unto death, secured the establishment of the mediatorial form of moral government amongst the human race, and the promulgation of the law of faith in his name as the rule by which the conduct of every man ought to be regulated.*

We have already shown, from the undeniable fact that God has established a mediatorial form of government amongst mankind, that it must have been his design, in the scheme of redemption, to favour the human race with such a manifestation of his goodness; and it remains here to show that this general end has been attained by means of the death of Christ.

Now the truth of the proposition, that Christ died with the intention to establish the mediatorial economy amongst mankind, might be shown from the consideration, that the divine purpose which determined this end is as truly his own purpose, as the second person of the Godhead, as it is the purpose of the Father and of the Holy Spirit; for if he purposed this end, and if, in common with the other persons of the Trinity, he

always does what he purposes to do, and never acts in vain, then assuredly he must by means of his death have infallibly secured its accomplishment.

The truth of this proposition might also be shown from the consideration, that the establishment of the mediatorial dispensation amongst mankind formed one of the ends of those transactions that took place between the Father and Son in the covenant of grace; for if he engaged to effect this end—if faithfulness is one of the perfections of his character—and if it is a ground of the certainty of events, then it follows that he could not fail in fulfilling his engagement, and in securing a revelation of the mercy and grace of God to fallen man. But passing from these arguments, we appeal to the direct statements which the Spirit of God gives us on this point in the holy scriptures.

In proof that one end of Christ's death was to establish the mediatorial form of government amongst mankind, and to promulgate the law of faith in his name, as the rule by which the conduct of all men ought to be regulated, and that it was efficacious as a means to this end, we appeal—

1. To the words of the apostle Paul in Romans xiv. 9–12. 'To this end,' says he, 'Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living. . . . For we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. For it is written, Every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then, every one of

us shall give an account of himself to God.' This passage clearly sets before our minds, 1st. One important end that was effected by the death of Christ. It distinctly affirms that he died, and rose, and revived, *that he might be Lord;* that is, that he might be sovereign ruler over men, that he might obtain dominion over them as mediator, and that he might rule and judge all according to the laws of the mediatorial form of government. And, 2dly, it as distinctly teaches us the universal extent of this end—that it is not special and restricted to God's elect, but general and common to the whole human race, as all sinful beings, and equally the subjects of the mediatorial government of God. This is evident, (1.) from the explicit statement of the passage itself. He died to this end, that he might be Lord *both of the dead and living;* that is, of the whole human race; for the dead and the living comprehend all men. (2.) From the statement that *we shall all stand* before the judgment-seat of Christ; for he shall judge all men, whether righteous or wicked. (3.) From the text which he quotes from Isaiah xlv. 23, in confirmation of this statement: 'For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.' While the righteous, at the last day, shall bow the knee to Christ in reverent adoration of him as their Lord and Saviour, the wicked shall then also be constrained to bow the knee to him, and be convinced that he rules over them, and has power to slay them, because they would

not that he should reign over them. (4.) And from his announcement of the responsibility of all men to Christ as their lawgiver and judge. 'So then, *every one of us* shall give account of himself to God.' On the whole, this passage is an incontestible proof that Christ died to establish the mediatorial form of government amongst mankind generally, and that, in consequence of his death, all men are bound to believe in his name, and to obey him as mediator, and Lord both of the dead and living.

2. We appeal to the testimony of Christ himself. 'All power,' says he, 'is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.' (Matt. xxviii. 18–20.) Does not this passage prove beyond a doubt that the Saviour, in consequence of his death and resurrection, has obtained, as mediator, authority over the human race; that he actually gives laws to mankind, as their Governor and Lord, and that all men, therefore, are bound to regard his revealed will as the rule of their faith and practice, and to observe all things whatsoever he has commanded them?

3. We appeal to the terms of the message which the apostle Peter addressed to the Jews on the day of Pentecost. 'Let all the house of Israel,' says he, 'know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both LORD and Christ. . .

Repent and be baptised, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.' (Acts ii. 36, 38.) Does not this passage distinctly affirm that God the Father has constituted Jesus LORD, or Mediatorial Governor over all, in consequence of his sacrificial death? And does not the act of Peter, in calling every sinner in that immense assembly which he then addressed, to repent and be baptised in the name of Jesus Christ, prove that all men are under his authority as mediator, and bound to seek the remission of their sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost through the blood of the cross, according to his commandment?

4. And lastly, in proof that one of the ends and effects of Christ's death was to place the whole human race under the mediatorial form of government, we appeal to the sermon which Peter preached to Cornelius and his company, when God opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles. 'Of a truth,' says he, 'I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him. The word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ, he is *Lord of all.* . . . And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead. To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth on him shall receive remission of sins.'

(Acts x. 34–36, 42, 43.) Does not the apostle Peter, in this sermon, distinctly assert that Jesus Christ, as mediator, has been constituted '*Lord of all*'—Lord of all nations, of the Gentile nations as truly as of the Jewish—and that the gospel of his grace should accordingly be preached to sinners of mankind indiscriminately—to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews? Does he not as plainly affirm, that the Saviour commanded him and the other apostles to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he who was ordained of God to be *the Judge of the living and dead*, that all men might perceive their accountability to him as Lord of all, and be sensible of the obligations which rest on them, as placed under the mediatorial dispensation, to seek salvation through faith in his name? And does he not give witness, in common with all inspired writers, that through his name, whosoever—that is, of all the people of the nations—believeth in him shall receive remission of sins?

On the whole, we conclude, from these passages of Scripture, that one design of the Saviour, in becoming obedient unto the death of the cross, was to establish the mediatorial form of government amongst mankind generally, and, consequently, to place all men under obligations to hear and obey him as their Lord and Judge in all things whatsoever he should say unto them, and that his death has been efficacious as a means for the attainment of this end.

Explanatory Observations.

Having established the truth of the above conclusion, we might proceed to consider the end of Christ's death in regard to those who shall be saved; but before doing this, we beg to call the attention of the reader to the following observations in further explanation of this important branch of the subject:—

1. *The law by which God governs man under the mediatorial dispensation is the moral law administered on evangelical principles.*

The Saviour did not die, as some have alleged, to establish a new law—a law adapted to the sinful state of fallen man, and that does not require perfect but only sincere obedience as the condition of the sinner's justification before God. According to this theory, would not the holiness of God, which determines the nature of the law and the perfection of its demands, be represented as defective and mutable? for how could he be infinitely holy if he were satisfied with an imperfect holiness in any of his creatures? Would not the divine commandments, 'Be ye holy for I am holy, Be ye perfect even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect,' be either ignored or impiously denied? Would not faith in God and love to him be mere arbitrary appointments, and not be as they confessedly are, duties of the moral law? Would not the doctrine of the gratuitous justification of the ungodly through the righteousness of Christ, according to the arrangements of the covenant of grace, be rejected,

and that of a new covenant of works, requiring sincere obedience as the condition of life, be substituted in its room? Besides, is it not an absurdity in thought, and a solecism in language, to represent any law of the only wise God as requiring imperfect obedience to its own demands? Would not such a law be regarded by all sane minds as a nullity in earthly legislation? This theory, therefore, which is so absurd in its nature, and which involves such consequences, is manifestly unscriptural, and must be ruinously deceptive to every one who embraces it.

Neither did the Saviour die to constitute faith in God and obedience to him the duty of man. The duty of man, as a rational and responsible agent, is founded on the necessary and immutable relations which he sustains to God as his Creator and moral Governor. Being a creature and a subject of moral government, he must, from the very nature of things, be bound in every state of his existence to believe whatever God reveals, and to do whatsoever God commands. If, therefore, human duty is founded on these necessary and natural relations, it follows that Christ did not die to constitute faith in God and obedience to him the duty of man. Moreover, if faith and obedience are thus due to God on the immutable principles of equity, then these duties cannot be founded on the death of Christ, for that event was exclusively an effect of divine sovereignty.

Nor did the Saviour die to furnish sinful men with

a new object of faith and love. Jehovah is necessarily and immutably the only object of religious faith and worship, and all rational beings, in every period and condition of their existence, are bound to believe and obey him. 'There is no God else besides me, saith the Lord, a just God and a Saviour, there is none besides me.'

But the Saviour died that God, in consistency with the claims of his law, might reveal himself to fallen man, as the object of faith *in a new aspect of his character*—even as the God of mercy and of salvation. Under the law of works the Almighty revealed himself to our first parents simply as their Creator and Lord and sovereign Benefactor; but under the mediatorial dispensation he, in addition to this, reveals himself to the human race, in consequence of the death of Christ, in his character as the God of mercy, and as in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them. Under both of these economies the object of man's faith and love is necessarily the same—Jehovah himself; but under the latter, in consequence of the work of Christ, God has given us a more extensive revelation of his nature and perfections, and has furnished us with more matter of belief than under the former. While, therefore, as the creatures of God and the subjects of his moral government, we are equally bound as Adam in Paradise was to believe and obey God as our Creator and Lawgiver, we, at the same time, as sinners placed under the

economy of grace, are additionally bound to trust in his name as the God of mercy, that we may be saved of the Lord with an everlasting salvation. Hence we find that God commands all men, saying, 'Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else.'

And, further, the Saviour died that the moral law might be administered among mankind on evangelical principles. The law by which God governs man under the mediatorial economy is essentially the same as that by which he governed him both in his primeval state and under the Edenic dispensation. It is the moral law—the immutable and universal law of the divine government. All men, though sinners, are still under the obligations of this law, and equally bound to believe in God, to love and obey him, according to the revelations and ordinances of the mediatorial form of government, as Adam was, according to the revelations and law of Paradise. Under the mediatorial economy there is no change whatever in the nature of the law, but simply in the form of its administration. Under the Edenic dispensation, the Almighty delivered the law immediately to man; but under the remedial economy he delivers it to him mediately—by the hands of a mediator. Under the Edenic dispensation Adam was commanded to believe in God and to obey him, as his Creator, and bountiful Benefactor, and righteous Lord; but under the mediatorial dispensation all men are commanded to

believe in God and to obey him, not merely in these aspects of his character, but also as the God of mercy and the Saviour of sinners. Under the Edenic dispensation the law was delivered to Adam as a covenant of works; but under the mediatorial dispensation it is given to sinners simply as a rule of life. Under the Edenic dispensation the law was delivered to Adam that he might obtain eternal life for himself and his race, by personal obedience to its precepts; but under the mediatorial dispensation it is given to sinners that they may obtain the knowledge of their transgressions—that they may seek salvation through the obedience of Christ, who is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth—and that they may show their gratitude to the God of salvation by keeping its commandments. The law, in a word, was administered to man in Paradise according to the principles of the covenant of works; but it is now administered according to the principles of the covenant of grace. Hence we find that God, in promulgating it from Mount Sinai, says, 'I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me,' etc. The preface to the law plainly teaches us that God now requires men to keep his commandments not merely because he is Jehovah, and has a natural right to their obedience, but also because he is the covenant God and Redeemer of Israel. We are not, therefore, to keep the laws of

God that we may obtain redemption from sin and misery on the ground of our personal obedience, but because Christ died to fulfil the law and to secure this blessing to every sinner who would come unto God by him. The work of Christ in redemption is not the effect of man's holiness, but a means to this end. It is the foundation on which the entire fabric of christian morality and happiness is erected, and it has created additional obligations and furnished new motives to holiness. 'Ye are not your own,' says the apostle Paul to believers, 'for ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's;' that is, by right of redemption.

'The revelation contained in the scriptures,' says Dr Wardlaw, 'is addressed to men as sinners against God, and its grand design is not to make known the way of obedience, but the way of recovery from a state of disobedience—of restoration by pardon of sin and renovation of heart, to the forfeited favour and the lost image of God. Still, however, the law is there. It is there both for the purpose of convincing men of sin and showing them their need of mercy, and to be the rule of life to those by whom the mercy revealed in the gospel is accepted; to constrain men, by a right view of their exigencies, to believe, and then to regulate the life of the believer. But since there cannot be two laws—two different rules of duty—the moral law of revelation is the same with the moral

law in the heart of the first man, and so far this department of revelation may be allowed to be a republication of the law of nature. The special discoveries of the gospel present new and peculiar motives to obedience—motives which make their appeal to the obligations under which saved sinners lie to the mercy that has saved them. But in the great principles of moral rectitude, revelation makes no change, and the specialities of duty which it inculcates will be found no more than the modified exercise—the exercise modified by the circumstances in which men are placed by the gospel—of those great principles.'—(Dr Wardlaw's Christian Ethics, pp. 170, 171.)

2. *The work of Christ in becoming obedient unto death for the purpose of establishing the mediatorial form of government amongst mankind, has in this aspect of it a relation to the whole human race.*

That the work of Christ has a relation to the whole human race is evident from the four following considerations :—

(1.) That Jesus Christ rules as mediator over all men. 'The kingdom is the Lord's, and he is the governor among the nations.'

(2.) That the Mediator bestows on men, indiscriminately as sinful and rational beings, the outward means of salvation. These are all comprehended in the holy scriptures. The scriptures, in the revelations which they give us of the sinfulness and misery of man—of

the character of God as the God of salvation,—of the divine purpose of mercy and means of its accomplishment,—of the ordinances of grace established in the church,—of man's duty and his obligations to perform it,—of the promise of eternal life as a motive to faith in Christ and obedience to his laws,—and of the threatening of eternal death as the penalty of unbelief and disobedience—'are able,' as says the apostle Paul, 'to make men wise unto salvation, through faith, which is in Christ Jesus.' But the scriptures are not given to men either as elect or non-elect, but simply to men as sinners, and to all men alike as placed in commonness under the government of the Mediator, and as equally responsible to him for the privileges they enjoy under his benevolent administration. Hence says Christ, 'I am the light of the world; he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.' (John viii. 12.) 'And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.' (John iii. 19; see also Matt. x. 14–15; xi. 20–24.) Nor is the gospel to be preached to men as elect, but to men simply as sinners, and to all men alike as under the same condemnation, and as equally needful of pardon, and at liberty to accept of it through the righteousness of Immanuel. Hence says Paul, 'Be it known unto you, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: . . . For so hath the Lord

commanded us, saying, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the ends of the earth.' (Acts xiii. 38, 47.)

(3.) That the Mediator commands sinners indiscriminately, as the subjects of his government, to believe on his name that they may be saved. The mediatorial law, as we have already seen, is the moral law administered on evangelical principles. It must, therefore, from its very nature, be binding on all men as placed under the dispensation of mercy. Hence says the Messiah, 'Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else;' and hence also an apostle declares 'that God now commandeth all men everywhere to repent.' (Acts xvii. 30.)

(4.) That all men shall be judged at the last day, and saved or condemned according as they believe and obey, or disbelieve and disobey, the gospel testimony and laws of the Lord Jesus Christ. God does not merely govern men in the present world according to the laws of the mediatorial dispensation; but as an apostle tells us, he will also 'at the last day judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to the gospel, and render to every man according to his deeds: to them who, by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, and honour, and immortality, eternal life: but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and

wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile: but glory, honour, and peace, to every man that worketh good; to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile: for there is no respect of persons with God.' (Rom. ii. 6–11, 16.)

Now if Jesus Christ rules as mediator over all men; —if he bestows on men indiscriminately, as sinners, the means of salvation;—if he commands them, as the subjects of his government, to believe on his name that they may be saved;—and if all men shall eventually be saved or condemned as they have believed and obeyed, or have disbelieved and disobeyed his testimony and laws; it evidently follows that his obedience unto death, in so far as it is the ground on which this form of moral government is established, must have a relation to the whole human race,—a relationship that is not special and restricted to God's elect, but that is general and common to all men as sinners, and equally the subjects of the divine government. Were it otherwise, how could they, according to the principles of equity, be placed under a dispensation of mercy at all, and be accountable for the privileges which they enjoy under such a system of divine benevolence?

In this sense, then, as it appears to us, the Saviour died for all men; that is, he so died for all men as to lay a foundation for the establishment of the mediatorial dispensation in our world, and for the unrestricted

and free proclamation of pardon to its guilty inhabitants, or to render it consistent with the claims of justice for God to reveal himself as merciful and gracious, and ready to save them to the uttermost that come unto him by Jesus Christ. (Ex. xxxiv. 6, 7; Ps. cxxx. 3, 4.) He so died for all as to bring salvation indiscriminately within their reach as sinners, or to favour them with the appointed means of salvation. (Acts xiii. 26; Rom. x. 6–13.) He so died for all as to put salvation in the choice of men as free agents and the subjects of his government. (Josh. xxiv. 15; John v. 40.) He so died for all as that he might reveal himself to the world in a saving character as the object of faith, and that sinners, as in duty bound, might look to him that they may obtain salvation through faith in his name. (John iii. 14–17.) He so died for all as to make in the gospel such a grant of eternal life to mankind generally, as warrants every sinner to receive it by faith. (John vi. 32–33; 1 John v. 10–11.) And he so died for all, as that those hearers of the gospel who shall finally perish, shall be condemned, not on the ground that there was no Saviour provided for them, but on the ground of their own sins in wilfully disbelieving and disobeying his testimony and laws, and in contemptuously rejecting what the apostle Jude designates 'the common salvation.' (Luke xix. 27.) Or in other words, the Lord Jesus Christ so died for all men as to give them, under the mediatorial form of government, an objec-

tive revelation of himself as the Saviour of sinners, and of his righteousness as a perfect and all-sufficient ground of their justification before God, and to favour them with his word and ordinances as the external means by which they may obtain, through faith in his name, the invaluable blessings of everlasting life.

Such is the sense, as we take it, in which the Saviour died for all men. And if the death of Christ has thus a general reference to the whole human race, what an interesting manifestation and proof does this give us of the benevolence and goodness of the Divine Being! And what encouragement does this present to every wicked and unrighteous man to forsake his evil ways, and to return unto the Lord, who will have mercy upon him, and to our God, who will abundantly pardon him! The holy angels extol the Lord on account of the manifestation 'of the kindness and philanthropy of God our Saviour toward man,' saying, 'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, *good-will toward men*;' that is, toward all men as sinners, and equally needful of a Saviour, even Christ the Lord. How criminal and blameworthy, therefore, must sinners of our race be, who have a far deeper interest in the work of Christ than the holy angels, if they do not praise the Lord for his goodness in placing them under a dispensation of mercy,—if they do not believingly and gratefully receive the Saviour whom he reveals and presents for their acceptance,—and if they refuse to deny ungodliness and worldly

lusts, and to live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world? The goodness of God in general, and the manifestation of it through the Mediator in particular, tends, as says the apostle Paul, to lead men to repentance; and if any sinner will impenitently despise the richness of his goodness, and forbearance, and long-suffering, shall he not thereby treasure up unto himself wrath against the day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgment of God? O that men, then, would praise the Lord for his goodness, and for his wonderful works to the children of men!

Some theologians, we are aware, object to the statement, that the Saviour died in some sense for all men, on the ground that such an opinion is inconsistent with the limited publication of the gospel in the world. It is unreasonable, they allege, to suppose that Christ died with the intention of placing all men under the mediatorial form of government, seeing the publication of its laws, as contained in the scriptures, has hitherto been enjoyed only by favoured sections of the human race.

In answer to this objection, we refer the reader to what has been already stated on this subject in the preceding chapter, and shall only further observe, that the objection is founded on the assumption that the extent of the mediatorial form of government is determined by the extent of the gospel revelation. Now, if this were the case, then it follows that Christ does not rule as mediator over men in heathen lands,

for the gospel has not been preached to them, and also that none of their children who die in infancy could be saved. Nay, more, if the extent of the mediatorial dispensation is to be determined by the extent of the gospel revelation, then, plainly, even none of the children of christian parents who die in infancy could be saved, for the gospel is not preached to them, and in that state of their existence they are incapable either of understanding or believing it. If, then, these inadmissible consequences are justly deducible from this objection, it follows that the objection itself must be vain and unfounded.

There is a manifest distinction between the work of God in establishing the mediatorial dispensation among men and his work in the administration of it. Though these two things agree in that they are both founded on the death of Christ, and are equally to be ascribed to the sovereign goodness of God as their originating cause, yet they differ in this, that the former is effected exclusively by divine agency, whereas the latter is effected by divine agency in connection, to a certain extent, with the agency of man. On the principle that the purposes of God may be ascertained from what he actually does, we are warranted to conclude that it was his purpose to render the administration of the mediatorial economy available to the whole human race, for he revealed Christ as the Saviour of sinners to our first parents in Eden, so that, if they and all other parents had appreciated that revelation, and

had been careful to transmit the knowledge of it to their children, as they ought to have done, every tribe of the human family would have continuously enjoyed, in their respective generations, the knowledge of the way of salvation through the promised Messiah. But, on the same principle, we are also warranted to conclude that it was not the purpose of God to give a revelation of his name as the God of mercy continuously to every section of the human race, irrespective of their own endeavours, as rational and accountable beings, to improve it for the ends to which it is subservient; for we find that he threatens to remove his gospel from those who are favoured with it, if they, in opposition to the strivings of his Spirit with them, by his word and providences, shall perversely and perseveringly refuse to walk in the light of it. 'Remember,' said he to the church of Ephesus, 'from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent.' (Rev. ii. 5.)

It is a principle of the divine administration that God withdraws, according as it seems good in his sight, the gifts of his sovereignty, which in equity he is not bound to bestow on any, from those who despise and abuse them (Matt. xxv. 18, 28); and also that he visits 'the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate him;' or, in other words, that he enforces obe-

dience to his laws by penal sanctions. A law without a penalty is a nullity, and can possess no efficacy as an instrument of moral government; for, on such a supposition, it would be nothing more than mere counsel or advice, which men might receive or reject according to their pleasure, and that with impunity. But the mediatorial dispensation has its laws. God commands men to believe on Christ and to repent of their sins, and therefore obedience to these laws must necessarily, from the very nature of law, be enforced by penal sanctions. Hence the Almighty threatens to take vengeance on them, in the future state, 'that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ;' and, what is to our present purpose, he also threatens to punish in the present world those nations and churches which despise and misimprove the gospel, by withdrawing from them this gift of his sovereign goodness. 'The kingdom of God,' said Christ to the Jews, 'shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.' (Matt. xxi. 43.) If, then, God, according to the principles of his moral government, enforces obedience to his laws by a penalty, and if the withdrawment of the gospel from those who despise and abuse it is of this character—even a punishment of loss—are we not warranted to conclude that all the sections of the human family which are at present destitute of the means of salvation have been righteously deprived of these means, in consequence of the sins of their fathers

in refusing to believe and obey the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that they shall continue in this state of spiritual destitution so long as they themselves shall walk according to the traditions of their fathers—after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ?

The fact that the gospel is not universally known by every tribe of the human race is not, therefore, to be ascribed to the agency of God, either in the institution or administration of the mediatorial economy among men; for in its nature it is available to all, its laws are obligatory on all, and its administration, as commencing with the first parents of the race, was fitted to perpetuate the knowledge of it to all, if they and their descendants had been faithful to the invaluable trust that was committed to them, and had been careful to teach their children the fear of the Lord. But the fact that the gospel is not universally known is to be ascribed entirely to the agency of men themselves, in perversely and ungratefully refusing to submit to the authority of the Mediator, and to trust in him for their own salvation, and in neglecting to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; and only to the agency of God in so far as he has judicially withdrawn it from them, as a punishment on account of their abuse of its privileges.

Hence we find that the scriptures ascribe the non-universality of the gospel in the world to the unbelief and sinfulness of men as its cause, and to the righteous judgments of God inflicted on them in consequence of

their sins in setting at nought all his counsel and in disregarding his reproofs. What is the reason why the heathen world is in a state of moral darkness and covered with the shadow of death? It is 'because that when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened,' and because, 'as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient.' (Rom. i. 21, 28.) What is the reason why the Jews for ages have been blinded, and have not known the truth as it is in Jesus? It is because, when the gospel was preached unto them, 'they put it from them, and judged themselves unworthy of everlasting life,' and because God, as a punishment for their unbelief, 'hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear, unto this day.' (Acts xiii. 46; Rom. xi. 8.) What is the reason why so many of our fellow-men, in this and other lands, are in a state of spiritual bondage to the Man of Sin, and the victims of a soul-ruining superstition? It is 'because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved,' and because God did send them, as a punishment for this sin, 'strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.' (2 Thess. ii. 10–12.)

On these principles, then, we conclude that the

non-universality of the gospel in the world presents no valid objection to the statement that Christ so died for the whole human race as to place them under a dispensation of mercy; nay, on the contrary, that it is an evidence of the truth of this doctrine, for if all men were not under the mediatorial form of government, how could the Saviour, in the administration thereof, withdraw the gospel from any portion of their number, as a punishment for their abuse of its privileges? Does not subjection to penal evil invariably presuppose antecedent obligation to that law or system of moral government to which it is annexed as a motive to obedience?

3. *The Saviour, in dying for the purpose of establishing the mediatorial form of government amongst mankind, acted in his official character, as the Father's servant and as a partaker of the human nature.*

We have already shown, in the preceding chapter, that the Son of God acts in the economy of redemption in a twofold character, namely, as the Father's servant and as the representative of a peculiar people; and we have also attempted to draw the line of distinction between the work that he performs in reference to all men, in the name of the Father and for the Father, as his servant, and that which he performs in reference to his people, in their name, and as their representative.

Without recapitulating what was there stated, we now observe, That the work of Christ, in so far as it

is the ground on which the mediatorial form of government is established amongst men, was performed by him, not as the representative of his people, but as the Father's servant. In mediating between God and man, he had not merely a work assigned him in relation to those who were given him of the Father,—to secure their reconciliation to God; but he had also a work assigned him in relation to God,—to render it consistent with the holiness of his nature, with the claims of his violated law, and with those principles of equity on which his moral government is conducted, to save any of our fallen race whatsoever, and to place all of them under the dispensation of mercy, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

Now it is here to be observed, that the Saviour accomplished this general end of the purpose of mercy by giving obedience to death in the human nature, as the Father's servant. In proof of this, we appeal to the words of the apostle Paul, when he says, 'Christ Jesus made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things (rather of beings) in heaven, and beings in earth, and beings under the

earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' (Phil. ii. 7–11.)

1. In this passage the apostle states one of the ends for which Christ became obedient unto death: He died that he might be LORD—that is, that he might, as mediator, be the Governor or Lawgiver and Judge of men, to the glory of God the Father. This is evidently the name that God hath given him, and which is above every name. And in the passage he further teaches us, that this end of Christ's death is not special, but general and common to all men, whether saved or lost: for it is said, that every human being in heaven, in earth, and under the earth should bow the knee at the name of Jesus; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father—that is, every man should obey the Saviour as the moral Governor and Judge of mankind, and all men in reality shall either serve him with a willing and grateful heart, or be constrained to acknowledge his authority over them by suffering the punishment that he will inflict upon them in consequence of their disobedience to the laws of his government. One end, therefore, according to this passage, which the Saviour designed to accomplish in reference to the whole human family by means of his death, was to erect his mediatorial throne in the world, and to rule over all its inhabitants as their LORD, to the glory of God the Father.

2. In this passage the apostle also states that *the obedience of Christ unto death* is the means or grounds on account of which he is LORD, or the moral Governor of all mankind. This is evident from the word in the beginning of the 12th verse translated 'wherefore' (διὸ). The conjunction διὸ signifies the reason or ground on account of which the thing spoken of takes place, as in Luke i. 35: 'The angel said unto Mary, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also (διὸ καὶ, and because of this, or for this reason,) that holy thing, which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God.' In like manner, when the apostle says that Christ became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; wherefore (διὸ καὶ and therefore, or on this account) God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name,—that of LORD; he distinctly affirms that his death is the means or ground on account of which this end of the purpose of mercy has been accomplished. The doctrine, therefore, which he here teaches, is not that the death of Christ is the ground on which God justifies and saves those who believe on him, but that it is the ground on which, as mediator, he has obtained power over all men, to govern them according to the laws of the christian dispensation; for if, as we have shown, the passage refers to an end of Christ's death that is general and common to man—that he might be LORD of all; then the apostle by this phraseology

obviously asserts that this end was accomplished by means of his obedience unto death.

3. But what is chiefly to our present purpose, the apostle in this passage distinctly states that Jesus Christ gave obedience unto death for the attainment of this end in his official character *as the Father's servant, and as a partaker of the human nature.* 'Being equal with God, he took upon him,' says he, '*the form of a servant*, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.'

(1.) These words distinctly teach us that Christ gave obedience unto death in his official character *as the Father's servant*, that he might be LORD of all, according to the mediatorial form of government: 'He took upon him the form of a servant.' Jesus Christ, as mediator between God and man, had a work assigned him in relation to God and to the law of works as broken by Adam, namely, to render it consistent with the threatening by which obedience to that law was enforced, for God to establish a dispensation of mercy amongst our fallen and guilty race. Adam's sin, in violating the law of works, and the consequent subjection of himself and of his posterity to death, the penalty of that law, were LEGAL OBSTACLES in the way of the establishment of a mediatorial form of government amongst mankind, and the removal of these barriers was indispensably necessary to the at-

tainment of this end. Unless the condition of the covenant of works had been fulfilled, and perfect obedience given to the law of God, and unless its penalty had been endured by Christ as mediator, it is evident that God, in consistency with his justice and faithfulness, could neither have established a dispensation of mercy among fallen men, nor saved any of their number. 'Without shedding of blood is no remission.' But the Saviour became obedient unto death, and by means of this work he has removed both of these legal obstacles, which stood in the way of the establishment of the mediatorial dispensation amongst mankind, and rendered it consistent with the holiness of God, and with the equity of his government, to place the whole race under his administration as mediator, and to command all men to submit to his authority, and to yield obedience to his laws that they may be saved. 'His work is, in itself, of a justice-satisfying and law-magnifying nature, containing the *utmost* of what law and justice can require for repairing the whole breach of the covenant of works, and fulfilling the same, in order to the justification of mankind-sinners as such, who are warranted to betake themselves thereto by faith.'—(Gib's Display, vol. ii., p. 141.)

Now, the apostle asserts that the Saviour removed those *legal obstacles* which stood in the way of the establishment of the mediatorial economy amongst mankind, by what he did and suffered in his official

character as the Father's servant. It was, he assures us, in consequence of that obedience unto death which he gave to the Father as his servant, that he is exalted to be LORD to the glory of God. It was undoubtedly necessary, as we shall afterwards see, to the accomplishment of the special end of the purpose of mercy, that Christ should act in the name, and as the representative of those who shall be saved; but nothing more appears to be necessary on God's account for the accomplishment of the general end of that purpose, or the establishment of the mediatorial dispensation among men, which is the thing spoken of in this passage, than that the Mediator should remove those legal obstacles which the sin of Adam had placed in the way of man's salvation, and this the apostle tells us Christ accomplished when he died for this purpose in the name of the Father, and as his servant.

(2.) These words also distinctly teach us that the Saviour gave obedience unto death, as a partaker *of the human nature*, that he might be LORD of all, according to the mediatorial form of government. He became obedient unto death, the apostle tells us, 'as made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man.'

These expressions state the nature in which Christ died, and therefore designate that order of rational beings to which his ministrations, as the Father's servant, have a reference. He took not on him the nature of angels—for he had no merciful intentions

in regard to those of their number who kept not their first estate—but he took on him the nature of man; for it was his design to die in that nature, and to place the human race, by this means, under a dispensation of mercy. In consequence of the Saviour's death in the human nature, it follows, therefore, that the children of men are not, like the evil angels, reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day; but that they are 'prisoners of hope,' that a way of escape from the ruins of the fall is provided for them, and that they may obtain salvation by means of repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.

These expressions, however, do not merely state that the Mediator sustains a relation to the human race as the man Christ Jesus, but also that this relation is indiscriminate in its character, and common to all men. When it is said, 'he was made in the likeness of men,' or was made a partaker of the human nature, it is evident that this relationship is not peculiar to any class of the race, but common to all—both to the elect and non-elect, for both are equally partakers of the nature of man, which he assumed. And it is also evident that this relationship is not of a representative character, like that which Adam sustained to his posterity under the covenant of works; for though he was made in the likeness of men, and was thus equally allied to the whole race, yet this assumption of human nature did not constitute him their representative. Legal and moral sub-

stitution can only be predicated of persons and not of a nature. Hence the scriptures invariably speak of the incarnation of Christ, not as his substitution in room of the nature of man, but as his *actual assumption* of humanity, and as an element which entered into the constitution of his mediatorial character, and which fitted him for the performance of his mediatorial work. 'The Word,' they declare, 'was made flesh;' and again, 'He was made in the likeness of men.' Now if these things are so, it follows that the relationship which Christ sustains to the human race is not that of a representative, but a relationship arising from the connection he sustains to them as actually a partaker of their nature.

And further, these expressions state to us the means in consequence of which the mediatorial dispensation of mercy was established amongst mankind, and the principle on which its universality is founded. The mediatorial dispensation is established in our world on the ground that Christ, by means of his obedience unto death, has removed those legal obstacles which the sin of Adam had placed in the way of man's salvation, and thereby rendered it consistent with the demands of the law which he had violated, in God to reveal himself to our race as merciful and gracious, notwithstanding of that offence and the curse he had inflicted on them on account of it. And the universality of this dispensation is founded on the principle that he removed these legal obstacles

as made in the likeness of men, and as, therefore, equally related to the whole race by his participation of their common nature. While these barriers remained, the salvation of any man was legally and morally impossible; but now that these are removed, the salvation of all men is possible. 'With men salvation is impossible,' says Christ, 'but not with God; for with God all things are possible.'

On the whole, therefore, we conclude that it is the obedience of Christ unto death, viewed not as a satisfaction for the personal transgressions of men, but merely as the fulfilment of the law of works, both in regard to its precept and its penalty, and viewed as given to God by him, not as a representative, but simply as the Father's servant and as a partaker of the human nature, which constitutes the basis of that system of moral government by which he rules as mediator over the human race, and now 'commandeth all men everywhere to repent.'

4. *The work of Christ, in becoming obedient unto death, as the Father's servant and as a partaker of the human nature, for the purpose of establishing the mediatorial form of government amongst mankind, had a relation to God, viewed as a moral Governor, or as the Lawgiver and Judge of man.*

There is a manifest distinction between the character of God as a moral Governor and as a Sovereign. As a Sovereign he may either bestow or withhold blessings, as seemeth good in his sight; but as a moral

Governor he is necessitated, from the holiness of his nature, to act towards all the subjects of his government according to the principles of equity, or to give unto all that which is due to them. The mediatorial dispensation, therefore, when viewed as a system of benevolence to all men, and of special love to those who are saved, must be ascribed to the sovereignty of God; but when viewed as a system of moral government established in conformity with those laws by which he, as moral Governor, rules over all rational intelligences, it must be ascribed to the equity of his character. Sovereignty provided the Saviour, but equity determined and demanded the things which were necessary to be done and suffered by him, both for the establishment of the mediatorial dispensation amongst men, and also for the salvation of his chosen people. If God, therefore, as a moral Governor, invariably acts on the principles of equity, and gives unto all that which is due to them, it is evident that, since Adam had violated the law of works, and thereby brought himself and his posterity under its awful curse, the Judge of all was bound either to inflict on them the full penalty of his transgression according to the threatening of that law; or if he interposed for their salvation, to interpose in such a manner as to vindicate the claims of the law which Adam had violated, and the equity of that sentence which had been pronounced against the race on account of his transgression. The Judge

of all the earth must, from his very nature, do that which is right.

But God has interposed as a Sovereign on behalf of sinful men, and established a mediatorial form of government amongst them, in the room of that which was set aside in consequence of man's transgression; and that interposition, as we have seen, has been made in such a manner as to illustrate the justice of his character as a moral Governor, and to maintain the authority of his government and law; for the Mediator, as the Father's servant, and on his account, obeyed the precepts and suffered the penalty of the broken covenant of works, and thereby removed those legal obstacles which the sin of Adam had placed in the way of the manifestation of his sovereign goodness to the children of men. But if those obstacles which the Saviour removed arose from the sin of Adam in violating the law of that form of government which God, as a moral governor, established with man in Eden, then it follows that the work of Christ, in removing them, must have had a relation to God in the same aspect of his character—as the moral Governor and Judge of man, and must have given a full satisfaction to him for the offence of Adam in eating the forbidden fruit.

Now if the work of Christ, in removing those legal obstacles which the sin of Adam had placed between man and salvation, had a relation to God, as the moral Governor and Judge of men, and gave satis-

faction to him, in this aspect of his character, for that sin, then it is evident that his work has laid the foundation for the establishment of the mediatorial dispensation among the children of men; that it has rendered it consistent with the righteousness of God, and with the demands of his law, to reveal himself in his gracious character as the God of salvation, and to appoint the gospel to be preached to every creature; and that it is a righteous thing in God, as a moral Governor, to command all men to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ that they may be saved, and to promise salvation to every one who believes, and to threaten condemnation to every one who disbelieves, as motives to induce them to obey this commandment. And it is also evident that the salvation of all men, as placed under the mediatorial dispensation, is possible, as there exists now no legal obstruction on the part of God to prevent it.

The establishment of the mediatorial dispensation among men is not only, however, as we have endeavoured to prove in this section, one of the ends for which Christ died, and which was secured by his death; but it also formed one of the ends of the divine purpose of mercy, and of the covenant arrangements that were made between the Father and Son for its accomplishment. If God does nothing in time but that which he in eternity purposed to do, then it follows that the work of God, in benevolently placing all men under the mediatorial form of government, is

not an accidental, but a direct effect of Christ's death according to divine purpose and covenant arrangement. Unless this had been the will of God, it could neither have been an end for which Christ died, nor could his death have formed a valid foundation for the exercise of moral government over the human race according to the laws of the mediatorial dispensation. But God has actually placed the human race under a dispensation of mercy—he has commissioned his servants to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature—and he commands all men everywhere to repent; therefore we conclude, from those things which God has done, that it was his eternal purpose to furnish all men to whom the word of salvation is sent, with these external privileges and means of grace, and that this end of the purpose of mercy has been secured by the death of Christ. Is not the very existence of the mediatorial form of government amongst mankind an unquestionable evidence of the truth of this conclusion, that it was the will and good pleasure of God to place them under a dispensation of mercy?

Moreover, the administration of the mediatorial economy among men is conducted on the principle that God is able and willing to save them. Hence it is written, 'As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of

Israel?' (Ezek. xxxiii. 11.) And again, that 'God our Saviour will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.' (1 Tim. ii. 4. See also Ezek. xviii. 23, 31, 32; 2 Pet. iii. 9.) From these and similar texts of scripture, is it not evident, that it is the will of God to grant unto sinners indiscriminately a revelation of Christ and the means of salvation; and that it is also his will that all men, as bound by his law and a regard to their own interests, should improve the means of grace with which he favours them, and seek the knowledge of the truth that they may be saved? And if these things are so, is it not further evident, that no sinner shall perish under the gospel dispensation either because God is unwilling to save him, or because he does not enjoy the means of salvation; but because he himself is unwilling to come to God through the Mediator, and to use the appointed means for the attainment of this end? The cause of the condemnation of sinners is neither in the purpose of God nor in the work of the Saviour, but exclusively in themselves. Hence says Christ, 'Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life.' 'And this is the condemnation that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.'

The purpose of God in relation to the establishment of the mediatorial dispensation among men, in so far as it is a form of moral government, has no special

reference to any section of the human family, but extends alike 'to them that are saved, and to them that perish.' It has a relation simply to man as a fallen and sinful being, and to all men equally as involved in the same condemnation on account of their sins. Nothing more appears to be necessary to the constitution and establishment of the mediatorial form of moral government among men, than the provision and revelation of a Saviour—the appointment of appropriate means of salvation—and the enforcement of the observance of these means by suitable motives on the part of God, with natural ability of understanding and will, and freedom of choice on the part of man. But God has done all these things for man, and man, even in his fallen and sinful condition, confessedly still possesses these natural powers of understanding and volition. Hence, does not God, under the mediatorial dispensation, address all men as sinners equally needful of salvation? Does he not give them an objective revelation of Christ as the appointed Saviour of sinners, and all the outward means of salvation? Does he not command them, and all of them equally, to observe the means of grace, and to receive him into their hearts by faith, that they may be saved? Does he not set before them the most powerful motives to induce them to make choice of an interest in Christ as the one thing needful for their present and everlasting felicity? Does he not, by these means, bring salvation within

the reach of all in the external dispensation of the gospel? And are not all men, therefore, as rational and accountable beings, equally bound, by the authority of God as their common Lawgiver and Judge, to act in conformity with his revealed will, and to draw near to him through Christ in the ordinances of his grace, that they may be made wise unto salvation? In so far, then, as it was the purpose of God and the design of Christ in dying to establish the mediatorial form of government amongst mankind, and to put salvation thereby within the reach of all, or, in the language of scripture, 'to bring near God's salvation to the stout-hearted, that are far from righteousness;' both that purpose and that design must have a reference to men, neither as elect nor non-elect, but a general reference to them simply as sinners and the subjects of the divine government.

This, as it appears to us, is one of those fundamental principles on which we are to account for the general and indiscriminate call of the gospel, and for the universal terms which the Spirit of God frequently employs in relation to the death of Christ. The view of the death of Christ, as an event in consequence of which the human race are placed under a dispensation of mercy, and also the view of it as an event by which such a dispensation of grace was established among men, as is universal in its character, and not restricted to any people, in contradistinction to that which was local and chiefly confined to the Jewish nation, are

aspects of that death, which furnish us with two principles on which we can easily and naturally account for the universal character of the gospel call, and explain all those passages of scripture which speak of the death of Christ in reference 'to the world—to the whole world—to all men—and to every man.' We might here proceed to apply these two principles of scriptural exegesis in interpreting the passages referred to; but as this would extend the treatise beyond the limits we contemplate, we waive this branch of the subject.

5. *The purpose of God in relation to the establishment of the mediatorial dispensation among men, in so far as it is a form of moral government, does not secure the salvation of any sinner.*

If the mediatorial dispensation, viewed as a system of moral government, secured the salvation of sinners, then it is evident that all who are placed under it would be saved; but it is an undeniable fact that multitudes to whom the word of salvation is sent, and to whom the call of the gospel is addressed, refuse to give it their attention, to believe and obey it, and therefore die in their sins; and if so, it follows that the mediatorial dispensation, viewed abstractly as a form of moral government, secures the salvation of none.

There is a distinction between the design of God as a moral Governor and his design as a Sovereign, or as the God of salvation. In the former character he

establishes a mediatorial system of government among men; in the latter, he secures our submission to it. In the one he gives us, as rational beings, a revelation of the scheme of redemption; in the other he opens our minds to understand it. In the one he gives us, as fallen and sinful beings, an objective revelation of Christ as the appointed Saviour of sinners; in the other he disposes us to look to him and to put our trust in him that we may be saved. In the one he commands us, as the subjects of his government, to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ; in the other he brings us to yield the obedience of faith to this commandment. In the one he sets before our minds, as voluntary agents, eternal life that we may make choice of it; in the other he disposes us actually to choose it as the good part which shall not be taken away from us. In the one he states the obligations which rest upon us, as accountable beings, to believe on Christ and to keep all his laws; in the other he brings us to feel the force of these obligations, and to fulfil them. In the one, in a word, he renders salvation available to all, and places it within their reach; in the other he secures its enjoyment to those who comply with the laws of his moral government, or who seek it through faith in Christ Jesus. The design of God, therefore, in establishing the mediatorial dispensation among men, viewing that dispensation abstractly as a form of moral government, was not to secure the salvation of

sinners, but simply to place them 'under the law to Christ,' and to furnish them with those external privileges and ordinances of grace, by means of which they might come to the Father through him as mediator, and thus obtain the blessing of everlasting life. The outward call of the gospel, though connected as means and ends with the internal and efficacious call of the Spirit, is nevertheless distinct from it; and these two distinct things ought never to be confounded with each other.

II. *The Lord Jesus Christ, by means of his obedience unto death, has secured the actual salvation of a definite number of the human race from sin and misery and their redemption unto God.*

The Son of God, as we have endeavoured to show in the preceding part of this section, died for the human race, in so far as by that event he laid the foundation for the establishment of a dispensation of mercy in our world, and rendered it a righteous thing in God to command all men to believe on Christ, and to promise salvation to every one who believes. But this was not the only or principal end for which the Saviour died. The chief design of God, in the purpose of mercy in relation to man, as we have seen in the preceding chapter, was actually to save from sin and bring to glory a definite number of the children of men. Now, as this was the chief end of God in the purpose of mercy respecting man, so it is the

principal object for which the Saviour died, and which shall be accomplished by means of that event. He not only died in the human nature as the Father's servant, for the purpose of removing those legal obstacles which the sin of Adam had placed between man and salvation, and thus rendered the salvation of all sinners possible; *but he also died in the name and as the representative of a peculiar people, for the purpose of removing those* MORAL OBSTACLES *that exist in their state and character as depraved and sinful beings, and thus rendered their salvation absolutely certain.*

In illustration and proof of this proposition, we appeal to what an apostle says in Heb. ii. 10–17. This passage does not relate to the general end of Christ's death, like that in Phil. ii. 6–11, but to that end of his death which is special, and accomplished in those who are saved; for it plainly teaches us what it 'became him to do, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, *in bringing many sons unto glory;*' and what the Saviour actually did for the attainment of this—the highest and ultimate end of the purpose of mercy in regard to men.

1. In this passage God gives us a description *of those who shall eventually be saved.* They are described in ver. 13, 'as the children which God hath given unto Christ.' Those who shall enjoy eternal life are often spoken of in other parts of scripture as persons who were given by the Father to the Son, and who were given to him that he might lose none of them,

but raise them up unto the resurrection of life at the last day. (John vi. 37, 39; xvii. 2.) But if they who do evil shall come short of this blessing, and are to be raised unto the resurrection of damnation, then it is evident that Christ did not die with the intention of saving all, but only a definite portion of the human family, even those which were given him by the Father in the transactions of the covenant of grace.

In this passage, these are further described as 'the seed of Abraham.' Jesus died to deliver those who were given to him. 'For verily,' says the apostle, 'he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him *the seed of Abraham;*' or, as Moses Stuart translates the verse, 'Besides, he doth not at all help the angels; but he helpeth the seed of Abraham.' Now, what are we to understand by 'the seed of Abraham' here spoken of? Is it his *natural seed*, as a man? or his *spiritual seed*, as the father of the faithful? It cannot be his natural seed, as a man; because the help or aid he extends to them, as the preceding context shows, is to 'destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage,' and to bring them unto glory. But as he does not so help or save all the natural posterity of Abraham, it is evident that the expression cannot be restricted to them. By the expression, 'the seed of Abraham,' we must therefore

understand his spiritual offspring, as the father of the faithful. The Almighty God said to Abraham, 'I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant; to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.' 'Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness.' But this promise of salvation was given not to Abraham only, but also to all his seed after him; that is, to all who, like him, should believe in God; for an apostle tells us 'that it is sure to all the seed: not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all.' (Rom. iv. 16.) And again he says, 'The scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.' (Gal. iii. 22, 26, 29.) If, then, according to these texts of scripture, the saving blessings of God's covenant are to be given only to them that believe, and if believers only are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise, then it is evident that the phrase, 'the seed of Abraham,' does not include all men, but is restricted to those of their number who, like him, believe in God; and, consequently, that Christ, according to this passage, died with the special intention of saving only those of our race who come unto God by him,

and who, like Abraham, take hold of his covenant of promise by faith.

Further, in this passage the persons who are eventually to be saved are described, in reference to their number. 'God will bring,' says the apostle, '*many* sons to glory.' It is not the design of God, as these words indicate, to bring men to glory, irrespective of their character and conduct, as placed under the mediatorial dispensation; but only those of the race who, like Abraham, become the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. Nor is it his design to save only a few of mankind, but *many*—a great multitude which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and peoples, and tongues. 'I will multiply,' said God to Abraham, 'thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea-shore.' No man, therefore, is warranted to regard the divine purpose of mercy as contracted in its design. It is in its nature a purpose of the most expansive benevolence and love, and shall assuredly result in the everlasting salvation of countless myriads; yea, in all probability, of the greater number of our fallen and guilty race. It is indeed true that comparatively few of mankind, either in the present day or in past ages, have believed in Christ and been saved; but it will not be so always. In the millennial state of the church 'a nation shall be born to the Lord at once'—all nations are to be blessed in Christ—'and all,' saith the Lord, 'shall know me, from the least to the greatest.' Now, if

we view the thousand years of Christ's spiritual and triumphant reign on the earth, according to the acknowledged principle on which prophetic time is to be interpreted, namely, each day for a year, is it not more than probable that the greater proportion of the human family shall eventually be saved, and only the lesser lost, and that the Redeemer shall be glorified even in the number of the *many* sons whom he shall bring to glory, as well as in the character of that salvation which he bestows upon them?

2. In this passage the Spirit of God gives us a statement of *the end*, which the Saviour designed to accomplish in regard to the children which God hath given him—the spiritual seed of Abraham. This end was foretold. As those he intended to redeem were sinners and under the power of Satan, he came to save them from sin and all its penal consequences: 'to deliver them,' says the apostle, 'who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage;' or, as Moses Stuart translates the verse, 'to free those who, through fear of condemnation, had during their whole lives been exposed to a state of bondage.' As they had forfeited the heavenly inheritance, he came also to secure it for them, and to meeten them for its enjoyment—'to bring,' as the apostle says, 'the many sons unto glory.' The last of these ends includes the first. The one great end, therefore, according to this passage, which the Saviour intended to accomplish on behalf of all the spiritual seed of Abraham, was

to bring them unto glory—to fashion them in soul and in body like unto his own glorified humanity, and to give them an everlasting habitation in the kingdom of heaven. Nor can his merciful intention toward them be frustrated by the combined malice of earth or hell: 'I give unto my sheep eternal life,' says he, 'and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand.'

3. In this passage the Spirit of God also reveals to us *the means* by which the Saviour secured the attainment of this end to all the spiritual seed of Abraham. The means by which the many sons shall be brought to glory, are his death, viewed both in regard to its nature and its results. 'It was through death,' says the apostle Paul, 'that he destroyed him that had the power of death.' The obedience of Christ unto death is the ground on which both the general and special ends of the purpose of mercy are accomplished. In dying, however, to bring many sons unto glory, he not only sustained a general relation to them, as he did to all other men, but also a relation that was special and peculiar to themselves. Hence the apostle says, 'He took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him *the seed of Abraham*.' In accounting, as he does in Phil. ii. 6–11, for the accomplishment of the end of the purpose of mercy in reference to all men, he tells us that it was as made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, that he became obedient unto death: but in accounting, as

he does in this passage, for the special end of that purpose, he does not say that he took on him the nature of man, as the proper antithesis required, but that he took on him the seed of Abraham: that is, he died not merely as a man, and therefore related to the human race; but he died also as a descendant of Abraham, and therefore specially related to those of their number who shall, like the father of the faithful, believe the promise of God, and be saved through faith in Christ. If we adopt the translation of Moses Stuart, which appears to be the preferable one, it establishes the same conclusion: 'He doth not at all help the angels, but he helpeth the seed of Abraham.' To perceive this we ask: 1. To whom does Christ extend this help? It is not, the apostle tells us, to all men, but only to the seed of Abraham, or to those who believe. 2. What is the help he gives them? It is evidently of such a nature as delivers them from death and brings them to glory. 3. By what means does he thus help them? It was, as is evident from this passage and from the terms of the covenant that God established with Abraham, by means of his death as the seed of Abraham: 'In thy seed,' said God to him, 'shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.' But the seed in which men are to be blessed is Christ. Hence says Paul, 'Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ.' (Gal. iii. 16.)

Further, the apostle, in accounting, as he does in Phil. ii. 6–11, for the accomplishment of the end of the purpose of mercy in reference to mankind generally, tells us that it was the consequence of what Jesus did in the nature of man, '*as the Father's servant.*' But in accounting, as he does in this passage, for the accomplishment of the special and ultimate end of that purpose—the bringing of the spiritual seed of Abraham to glory—the apostle tells us that this was an effect of what he did for them *in their name and as their representative.* Hence he says, ver. 17, 'that Christ made reconciliation for the sins of the people as a merciful and faithful *high priest.*' Now, if the Jewish high priest, on the great day of atonement, confessedly acted in the name, and as the representative of the Israelites alone, and if his services invariably secured the peculiar privileges of the old economy to those whom he represented; then it follows that the great antitypical High Priest of the church, in taking hold of the seed of Abraham to bring them unto glory, must have acted in their name and as their representative, and thereby secured eternal life for them according to the terms of God's covenant.

Theologians of the *new school,* as they have been called, refuse to admit the truth of this conclusion. 'The atonement,' says Dr Beman, 'was required and made in order to open a consistent way for the publication of pardon, or for the exercise of grace to sinners.'

Again he says, 'All that the atonement has done for the sinner, is to place him within the reach of pardon.' —(Dr Beman on the Atonement, pp. 124, 137.)

The death of Christ has unquestionably opened a consistent way for the publication of pardon to sinful men. It has removed those legal obstructions which the sin of Adam, in violating the covenant of works, had placed between the mercy of God and the salvation of sinners, and thereby rendered it consistent with those immutable principles of equity on which his moral government is founded and administered in God—to command all men to believe on Christ—and to promise salvation to every one who believes. The death of Christ has rendered the salvation of all men possible notwithstanding of the fall of Adam, and the consequent depravity of the race; and, therefore, every sinner to whom Christ is preached is placed within the reach of pardon, or is furnished with the means of obtaining salvation. But assuredly his death has done unspeakably more for man than this: *It has infallibly secured the salvation of a definite number of the human family from a state of sin and misery, and their redemption to God.* Or, in other words, it has not merely removed those *legal obstacles* to the salvation of man which arose from the character and law of God; but it has also *secured*, in the case of all who are saved, the removal of those MORAL OBSTACLES which exist in their minds and character as sinners against God. This, we are firmly persuaded, is one of the cardinal doc-

trines of Christianity. And that the reader may have a correct view of the ends effected in regard to man by means of the death of Christ, and may also perceive the defective and unscriptural character of the new theology on this all-important subject, we shall now, in addition to what has been already stated, adduce the following arguments in proof of the truth of that proposition :—

1. That Jesus Christ, by his death, infallibly secured the salvation of a definite number of our fallen race, is evident from the very nature of the purpose of mercy.

It was not the design of God, in the scheme of redemption, to save all mankind. If it were otherwise, does it not plainly follow that either all men would be finally saved, or that his design would be frustrated? But as both of these doctrines are unscriptural, we are shut up to the conclusion, that it was not his design to save all men through the Mediator. On the contrary, it was the design of God, in the purpose of mercy, to save only a part of the human race. This is evident both from the nature of that purpose, and also from the execution of it. In regard to its nature, it is not a purpose to save all to whom the gospel is sent, but only those who receive its glad tidings with joy, and who come unto God through Christ Jesus. And in regard to its execution, it meets its accomplishment when the Redeemer shall present not the world, but the church to himself a glorious church, not having

spot, or wrinkle, nor any such thing; and when all his children, as blessed of his Father, shall inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world.

The salvation of that illustrious company who are to stand on Christ's right hand in the great day of judgment, and who are to 'be ever with the Lord,' is the work of God. It was his work in the days of time to regenerate and quicken their souls when they were dead in trespasses and sins, and it is his work at the last day to raise their bodies unto the resurrection of life. But the works of God are all the effects of an antecedent purpose; for it is an incontrovertible maxim on the subject of the divine decrees, that God purposes all that he does, and does all that he purposes. Now, if salvation is the work of God, and if he invariably acts according to the purpose of his will; then it follows that the salvation of all the redeemed is the effect of a divine purpose. And further, if the purpose of God is immutable and cannot be frustrated; if, as he himself declares, 'my counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure;' then it also follows that their salvation is not a contingent event, depending, as Pelagians allege, entirely on man's free will, but an event which is absolutely certain, according to the evangelical theory, because it is the effect of 'the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.' Hence, it is said, that when Paul and Barnabas preached the gospel of Christ unto the

Gentiles at Antioch, 'As many as were ordained to eternal life believed.' (See also Rom. viii. 28–39.)

The redemption of those who shall be finally saved is not only infallibly secured by the purpose of mercy, but also by the means through which the ends of that purpose are accomplished. These are the distinct acts which each person of the Godhead performs in his economical character. Their salvation is the effect of the love of the Father in sending his Son into the world to seek and to save that which was lost,—of the love of the Son in giving his life as man for their life,—and of the love of the Spirit in justifying and sanctifying them in the name of Christ Jesus. Now, if, as we have shown in the first chapter of this treatise, the purpose of mercy is one purpose, and alike the purpose of the Father, Son, and Spirit; then it is evident that those works which the persons of the Godhead severally perform for its accomplishment must be done by them as designing agents, with the intention of securing the fulfilment of its ultimate end—that God may be glorified in the everlasting salvation of every one who believes. And it is further evident that the design of Christ, in laying down his life, must have been coincident with the design of the Father and Holy Spirit in the one purpose of mercy, and consequently that he must have died with the intention of bringing 'the many sons of God unto glory,' as the highest and ultimate end in regard to man to which that purpose is sub-

servient. But if Christ died with the intention 'of saving his people from their sins,' and if as a divine person his intentions cannot be frustrated, are we not warranted to conclude, that he infallibly secured by that event the redemption of all those who shall be finally saved, in conformity with the nature and end of that purpose which God, according to the good pleasure of his will, hath in eternity purposed in himself?

2. That Jesus Christ by means of his death infallibly secured the salvation of a definite number of our race, is evident from the arrangements which were made between him and the Father in the covenant of grace.

In the covenant of grace, as has been shown in the preceding chapter, the Father promised the Son that he should see his seed, on the condition of making his soul an offering for sin; when, therefore, the Saviour died and thereby fulfilled that condition, he evidently obtained a federal right to the salvation of all those who were given to him by the Father; and if so, it follows that their salvation was infallibly secured by means of his death, according to the terms of that covenant. 'Hence,' says an apostle, 'by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.' The salvation of believers, in its cause, in its nature, and in the time and manner of its bestowal, is, indeed, entirely a matter of sovereign grace and of rich mercy, in so far as they themselves are concerned; but in

reference to Christ it is a matter of justice, and due to him as the promised reward of his work in bearing their iniquities.

Moreover, in the covenant of grace the Father promised the Son that he should see his seed, not only on account of his sacrificial death, but also by means of his work in making intercession for them. 'Ask of me,' says the Father to the Son, 'and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.' (Ps. ii. 8.) Hence we find that the Mediator prays for their salvation. 'I pray for them,' says he; 'I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me. Neither pray I for these alone, (or for my apostles only,) but for them also which shall believe on me through their word. Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me.' (John xvii. 9, 20, 24.) If, then, Christ's intercession is ever prevalent, according to his words in addressing the Father, 'I know that thou hearest me always,' does it not plainly follow that the salvation of those who were given him by the Father is infallibly secured by the work which he is performing on their behalf in his exalted state in heaven, as truly as it was secured by the work which he accomplished for them in his state of humiliation on earth? The work of Christ, in offering himself a sacrifice and in making intercession for his people as their representative high

priest, is the ground on which the Father promised that 'he shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied.' Hence he says, (we quote the translation of Dr Lowth, which is more literal than that of the authorised version,) '*Therefore* will I distribute to him the many for his portion, and the mighty people shall he share for his spoil, *because* he poured out his soul unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors, and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors. (Is. liii. 12.)

If such, then, are the arrangements that were made between the Father and the Son in the covenant of grace, it is evident that the work of the Mediator, in fulfilling these according to the appointment of the Father, must have given him a federal right to the salvation of a certain number of the human race—even 'his seed,' as 'the joy that was set before him,' and consequently that their salvation was infallibly secured by the shedding and sprinkling of his blood, as 'the blood of the everlasting covenant.' The theory, therefore, which represents the work of Christ as resulting merely in the establishment of a dispensation of mercy amongst mankind, or in placing sinners within the reach of pardon, must be defective and unscriptural. The advocates of this theory, to be consistent, should either deny the existence of such a constitution between the Father and the Mediator as is called the covenant of grace, or admit

the truth of this conclusion. We leave the alternative to their choice.

3. That Christ, by means of his death, infallibly secured the salvation of a definite number of our race, is evident from those texts of scripture which affirm that he came into the world, and that he died with the *special intention* of saving them.

The Son of God came into the world and died, not merely to render it consistent with the character of God, and with those principles on which his moral government is founded—to reveal himself to all mankind as the God of salvation—and to establish the mediatorial dispensation amongst them; but also to secure the salvation of a definite number of the human family from their sins; not merely to make the salvation of all men possible, but also to render the salvation of some absolutely certain. In proof of this, we appeal to those texts of scripture which affirm that the chief end, in regard to man, for which the Son of God came into the world was to save a given number of our race from sin and misery, and to bring them to God and glory. "Did not the Saviour, long before the time of his incarnation, reveal the special and saving design of his mediatorial work, and foretell its appointed and glorious results in reference to his people, saying, 'I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction'? (Hos. xiii. 14.)

Did not the angel of the Lord, in giving the name to the child that was to be born of the Virgin Mary, reveal to Joseph the special design and ulterior results of the work that he was to perform in his state of humiliation, saying, 'Thou shalt call his name JESUS; for he shall save his people from their sins'? (Matt. i. 21.) And did not the Saviour himself distinctly proclaim to men that he came into the world for the special end of securing everlasting life to those who were given him of the Father, and who would believe on his name? 'The Son of man,' says he, 'came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.' (Matt. xx. 28.) And again he says, 'All that the Father giveth me shall come to me: and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out. For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day.' (John vi. 37–40.) These passages clearly teach us that it was the will of the Father, in sending the Son, and that it was the chief intention of the Son, in coming into the world, to secure, by means of his death, the eternal salvation of a definite number of the children of men. And if so, do they not prove the theory,

'that God's purpose in the atonement was merely to bring it within the reach of all to be saved,' to be unscriptural and deceptive?

Further, in proof that the work of Christ not merely rendered the salvation of all men possible, but also the salvation of some absolutely certain, we appeal to those texts of scripture which affirm that the Saviour has actually accomplished the end he had in view in coming into the world—even to die for the salvation of his people from their sins. 'I lay down my life for the sheep,' says Christ, 'and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish.' (John x. 15, 28.) 'Feed the church of God,' says the apostle Paul, 'which he hath purchased with his own blood.' (Acts xx. 28.) Again he says, 'Our Saviour Jesus Christ gave himself for us that (ἵνα, to the end that) he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works.' (Tit. ii. 14.) 'He was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.' (Rom. iv. 25.) And once more he says, 'But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ; and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus.' (Eph. ii. 4–6. See also Gal. i. 4; Eph. v. 25–27; John xvii. 19.) Now, can any intelligent man, who attends to the meaning of language, believe that the persons who in these texts are called Christ's sheep,

—the church of God—and a peculiar people, are all mankind without exception? And when the Saviour is said to have purchased these with his own blood—to have given himself for them that he might redeem them from all iniquity,—and to have been raised from the grave for their justification; and moreover, when, in consequence of their federal connection with him, they are said to be quickened and raised up and exalted together with Christ in his resurrection and exaltation—(that is, not actually, but legally and virtually in him as their representative and forerunner)—how can it be maintained, according to the new theology, that these expressions teach us 'that Christ died merely to place sinners within the reach of pardon,' without securing that blessing to any of their number? To put such an interpretation on them is obviously to pervert the meaning of language. To purchase the church is to acquire a right to it—to give himself for a peculiar people, to redeem them from all iniquity, and to purify them unto himself, is to secure these blessings for them at the time and in the manner of divine appointment—to die for their sins, and to be raised again for their justification is to secure pardon and the justification of life for them in the day of their effectual calling—and to raise them up together, and make them sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, is to secure the resurrection of life 'to every one in his own order; Christ the first-fruits, afterward they that are Christ's at his coming.'

If, then, these texts of scripture, both of the one class and of the other, prove that the phrases, Christ's people—the many—those who were given to him of the Father, and who believe on him—his sheep—his church—and a peculiar people, are terms of a distinctive character, and not applicable to all men; and if Christ came into the world with the special intention to save them, and if he actually accomplished this end by means of his death; are we not obviously shut up to one of two conclusions,—either that those who are thus described shall be infallibly saved on account of his death; or that his intention in giving his life for them may be frustrated, and some of them eventually lost? But the latter alternative is contrary to the immutable nature of the great love wherewith he loved them—to the infinite wisdom of all his purposes, and his ability to execute them,—and to the unequivocal testimony of his word, and therefore we must adopt the former as the truth of God on the subject.

4. That Christ, by means of his work in our world, infallibly secured the salvation of a definite number of our race, is evident from those texts of scripture which affirm that the redemption of believers is the effect of his sacrificial death.

According to the new theology, the salvation of sinners is not an effect of Christ's death. If 'God's purpose in the atonement was merely to bring it within the reach of all to be saved, and to place the sinner within the reach of pardon,' then it is evident

that the salvation of any sinner is an uncertain and contingent event, and must depend entirely on the power of his own will, and neither on the purpose of God in regard to Christ's death, nor on the intention of the Saviour in giving his life a ransom for many; for if God's purpose in the atonement was merely to bring it within the reach of all to be saved, then Christ's death has only accomplished this end, and rendered the salvation of all men possible. It could evidently effect nothing beyond the limits of that purpose. According to this scheme of doctrine, therefore, the *possibility of being saved, and not actual salvation*, is all that sinners owe to the Redeemer. In consistency with this theory, the new song of the church could not be, 'Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood;' but should run thus, 'Thou wast slain, and hast by thy blood merely put it in our power to be saved, and we are saved by our own power in taking hold of the pardon which thou didst place within our reach; to thee, therefore, and to ourselves be the united praise!'

If, however, the Son of God came into the world, not merely with the intention to open a consistent way for the publication of the gospel to men generally, or to place them within the reach of pardon, but also to secure the salvation of a definite portion of their number, and if he died for the accomplishment of this design, then it is evident that their salvation is not a contingent event, but an event which must certainly

follow as an effect of his death. The typical sacrifices of the law, when presented to God according to his appointment, invariably secured pardon and deliverance from evil to those who offered them. When the priest made atonement for the congregation of Israel, if they had sinned through ignorance, God said, 'It shall be forgiven them.' (Lev. iv. 20.) When the priest made atonement for the man who had trespassed against the Lord by acting dishonestly towards his neighbour, by lying or by swearing falsely, God said, 'And it shall be forgiven him, for anything of all that he hath done in trespassing therein.' (Lev. vi. 7.) When Aaron stood between the dead and the living, and made an atonement for the people because of the sins which they had committed in the matter of Korah and his company, it is said, 'And the plague was stayed.' (Num. xvi. 48.) And when the high priest, on the great day of atonement, made atonement for the children of Israel because of their transgressions in all their sins, by killing the goat of the sin-offering, and by sprinkling its blood upon the mercy-seat and before the mercy-seat, to cleanse them that they might be clean from all their sins before the Lord, the consequence was that all their iniquities were borne by the scape-goat unto a land not inhabited; that is, their sins were forgiven them. (Lev. xvi. 22, 30.) If, therefore, the typical sacrifices of the law secured pardon to the children of Israel, and were the means of cleansing them from all their sins before the Lord,

shall it for a moment be supposed that the sacrifice of Christ, which these prefigured, and from which they derived all their efficacy, did not produce similar effects, and did not secure pardon and the other blessings of God's covenant to the tribes of his spiritual Israel? The supposition is absurd: 'For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works, to serve the living God?' (Heb. ix. 13, 14.)

In proof that the redemption of believers is an effect of Christ's death, we appeal also to the following texts of scripture, selected from many which might have been adduced for this purpose: 'Neither by the blood of goats and calves,' says the apostle Paul, 'but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, *having obtained eternal redemption for us.*' (Heb. ix. 12.) 'Meaning,' says Dr Bloomfield *in loco*, 'that he entered once for all into the holy of holies, after having obtained eternal redemption for us, by his own blood.' In this passage it is distinctly affirmed, that the redemption which the Saviour, in his exalted state, bestows on his people in their respective generations, was obtained or acquired for them by the blood which he shed in the outer court of this world, before he entered heaven, the true holy place. And if so, must they not receive this blessing as an

effect of his death? Again the same apostle says, '*In whom* (that is in the Beloved) we have redemption *through his blood*, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace.' (Eph. i. 7.) In this text it is also distinctly affirmed that believers receive redemption and the forgiveness of sins, as the result of the death of Christ; for they are said to have or possess it through his blood. And this redemption is the effect of the death of Christ, in consequence of their covenant connection with him as their representative; for it is *in him* they have redemption, and *in him* they have obtained an inheritance, (ver. 11,) that is, as the context shows, because they were chosen in him, and because they were predestinated unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ. (Ver. 4, 5.) And once more it is written, 'As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners; so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.' (Rom. v. 19.) If, according to these words, the disobedience of Adam was the cause of sin and death, is it not evident, both from the antithesis contained in the verse and also from its explicit statement, that the obedience of Christ, 'the second man,' is the cause of righteousness and life?

In further proof that the salvation of believers is the effect of the death of Christ, we appeal to the new names which are given to them by the Spirit of God, in consequence of that event. They are called 'the ransomed of the Lord.' (Is. xxxv. 10.) The holy

people—the redeemed of the Lord—(Is. lxii. 12.)—and a peculiar people—(λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, a people for a possession—a purchased people, 1 Pet. ii. 9; Tit. ii. 14) —and this redemption is called the redemption of *the purchased possession*, (τῆς περιποιήσεως, of the purchased people. Eph. i. 14.) Now, as these distinctive appellations are founded on the death of Christ, is it not plain that he must have died with the special intention to redeem a certain number of our race, or to acquire them as a possession for himself, and consequently that their actual redemption, in the day of effectual calling, is the execution of that intention and an effect of his death?

And finally, in proof that the redemption of the people of God is an effect of Christ's death, we appeal to the undeniable fact, that they ascribe their redemption to the agency of the Lamb of God, and to his death as its meritorious cause: 'They sing a new song, saying, Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests.' (Rev. v. 9, 10.) In this song the people of God do not only ascribe their redemption in the day of regeneration to the agency of Christ, saying, 'Thou hast made us unto our God kings and priests,' but they also ascribe that redemption to his death as its meritorious cause, saying, 'Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God (ἠγόρασας τῷ Θεῷ, thou hast bought us to God by a price

paid) by thy blood.' The word here translated redeemed is not the verb λυτρόω, which signifies *to let go free, to deliver* for a ransom, as in Tit. ii. 14; 1 Pet. i. 18; but the verb Ἀγοράζω, *to buy, to purchase, to acquire for one's self by a price paid or by a ransom*, as in Matt. xxvii. 7; Mark vi. 37; and in 1 Cor. vi. 20; vii. 23. It denotes not the redemption or deliverance itself, but the ground on which this blessing is obtained. In this song, therefore, the ransomed of the Lord plainly ascribe their exaltation to the honours, and the services, and blessedness of the christian royalty and priesthood, unto the sacrificial death of Christ, as its meritorious cause.

On the whole, then, if it is evident from the above passages of scripture that the redemption of the people of God is the effect of Christ's death as its meritorious cause, does it not follow, according to the acknowledged connection which exists between cause and effect, that he has infallibly secured, by means of his death, the salvation of a definite number of the human race, — the many sons whom he is eventually to bring unto glory? And does it not also follow, that the theory which represents the death of Christ as an event which merely renders the salvation of all men possible, is false and unscriptural?

5. That the Lord Jesus Christ, by means of his death, infallibly secured the salvation of a definite number of our race, is evident from those texts of scripture which affirm that the salvation of believers

is the immediate effect of the agency of the Holy Ghost in renewing their hearts, and which speak of the mission of the Spirit for this purpose as the consequence of his death. The obstacles which stand in the way of the salvation of sinners are, as we have seen, of two classes: *First*, legal obstacles, or those which arise from the character and law of God. *Secondly*, moral obstacles, or those which arise from the character of man, as a depraved being and a sinner against God. Unless the obstacles of the first class had been removed, God, as a righteous governor, could not have established the mediatorial dispensation in our world, and the salvation of any sinner would have been a moral impossibility. But Christ, by his obedience unto death, as we have already shown, has removed those legal obstacles which the sin of Adam placed between man and salvation, and has, therefore, opened a consistent way for the publication of pardon to the chief of sinners, and rendered the salvation of all men possible. Unless, however, the obstacles of the second class are also removed, none of our race would actually enjoy the blessings of salvation; for it is written, 'Without holiness no man shall see the Lord'—but Christ, by his death, as we have proved by the preceding arguments, has secured, in the case of all who are saved, the removal of those moral obstacles which exist in their minds as sinners against God—their ignorance, their unbelief, and their unwillingness to come to Christ that they might have life.

Now, if the Saviour has secured the removal of this latter class of obstacles, the reader will naturally ask: *How has this been effected by means of his death?*

In reply to this question, we observe, that Christ, by means of his death, secured, in the case of those who are saved, the removal of those obstacles which exist in their minds as depraved and sinful beings, because he thereby secured the mission and influences of the Holy Ghost to accomplish this end of the covenant of grace. The removal of native depravity, of the ignorance of the human mind, of the enmity of the carnal heart, of the unbelief of the sinner, and of his unwillingness to come to Christ that he might have life, is unquestionably effected by the personal agency of the Holy Spirit, in the day of effectual calling, through the instrumentality of the word of God. The scriptures plainly teach us that it is the work of the Spirit of God, in his economical character as the 'Spirit of Christ,' to enlighten the mind of the ignorant in the knowledge of Christ (John xvi. 13–15)—to quicken and regenerate the soul that is dead in trespasses and sins (John iii. 5, 6, 63)—to justify the ungodly and condemned (Rom. v. 1; 1 Cor. vi. 11)—to sanctify the unholy (1 Cor. vi. 11)—to conduct the spirits of the righteous at death to glory (Ps. cxliii. 10)—and to raise their bodies unto the resurrection of life at the last day. (Rom. viii. 11.) Though, however, the actual removal of these obstacles is effected by the personal agency of the

Holy Ghost, yet their removal must nevertheless be ascribed to the death of Christ; for the shedding of his blood, viewed in connection with his all-prevalent intercession founded thereon, is the meritorious ground on which the Spirit is sent forth by the Father to effectuate this end of the purpose of mercy. The Saviour did not merely secure, in regard to men generally, by means of his death, the agency of the Spirit, in so far as to give them in the holy scriptures an objective revelation of the will of God for their salvation, and thus to place them under the laws of the mediatorial dispensation, and within the reach of pardon; but he also by his death secured, in regard to some of their number, those subjective and efficacious influences of the Spirit, which were necessary to open their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures, and to incline their heart to receive the love of the truth, that they might be saved.

(1.) In proof of this doctrine, we appeal to the nature of the arrangements which were made between the Father and the Son in the covenant of grace. According to the arrangements of that covenant, as the apostle Paul tells us, sinners 'through Christ have an access by one Spirit unto the Father.' (Eph. ii. 18.) The Father not only sent the Son to open by his blood a way of entrance into the holiest of all; but he also promised to send the Holy Spirit to dispose sinners actually to draw near the mercy-throne by that new and living way. Hence we find that the

Holy Ghost is called the promise of the Father. 'Behold,' says Christ, 'I send the promise of my Father upon you.' (Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 4.) The Holy Spirit is called in these texts 'the promise of the Father,' because, as we understand the expression, the Father in the covenant of grace promised the Son, as mediator, to send the Holy Ghost, that he might by his personal agency accomplish the end for which he died in regard to his people, and actually bring them into a state of salvation, according to the arrangements of that covenant. This promise of the Spirit to save sinners, or to remove those moral obstacles to salvation which exist in their minds, is substantially the same as that promise of the covenant, 'He shall see his seed;' for how can any man enter into the kingdom of God except he be born of the Spirit? But the promise, 'He shall see his seed;' or, which is the same thing, the promise that the Holy Spirit shall be sent to bestow salvation actually upon them, was given to the Son as mediator, on the condition 'that he should make his soul an offering for sin.' When, therefore, he fulfilled that condition he obtained a federal right to receive the Spirit as 'the promise of the Father,' and thereby secured the regeneration and ultimate salvation of the seed who were promised to him in the everlasting covenant. Hence we find that the Saviour prosecutes this end of his death by making intercession for the Spirit as 'the promise of the Father,' that they might be en-

lightened and blessed by his saving influences, and eventually brought to glory. 'I will pray the Father,' says he, 'and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.' (John xiv. 16, 17.) And in fulfilling this promise, he prays the Father, saying, 'Father, I will that they whom thou hast given me be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me.' (John xvii. 24.)

Now, if the Holy Ghost is that person of the Godhead by whose agency those moral obstacles which exist in the minds of those who are saved are actually removed,—if his agency was promised by the Father to the Son in the arrangements of the covenant of grace, and that on the condition of his making his soul an offering for sin,—if the Saviour fulfilled that condition,—and if the Spirit is sent by the Father in answer to his prayer; then it plainly follows that Christ by his death secured the removal of all these obstacles, seeing he secured the agency of the Spirit, as the promise of the Father, to effect this object, and to save his people from their sins.

(2.) In proof of the doctrine, that Christ by means of his death secured, in regard to all those who are saved, the mission of the Holy Ghost, to remove by his gracious agency those moral obstacles which exist

in their minds as sinful beings, we also appeal to those texts of scripture which explicitly affirm that this was one of the great ends for which he died.

We appeal first to the words of the apostle Paul in Gal. iii. 13, 14. 'Christ,' says he, 'hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us . . . that (ἵνα, to the end that) we might receive the promise of the Spirit (that is, the promised Spirit) through faith.' Does not the apostle, in these words, most distinctly affirm, that one of the great designs for which the Saviour died was, that we might receive the Spirit through faith in his name? And does not the context show (see ver. 16) that this design was in perfect harmony with the arrangements of the covenant of grace; for the Spirit was promised to Christ, and in him to Abraham, and to his seed according to the promise; that is, to all of the race, who, like the father of the faithful, would believe in Christ, whether these were Jews or Gentiles?

We appeal also to the words of the same apostle in Gal. iv. 4, 5. 'God sent forth his Son,' says he, 'made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that (ἵνα, to the end that) we might receive the adoption of sons.' To receive the adoption of sons, is the same thing as to receive the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, 'Abba, Father;' for we become the children of God by that faith in Christ Jesus which is the fruit of the Spirit. When, therefore, the apostle in this passage

says, Christ died that we might receive the adoption of sons, does he not evidently affirm that one of the great ends of his death was to secure the mission of the Spirit, to remove those moral obstacles to salvation which exist in the minds of his people, and to make them the children of God?

In proof of the same doctrine, we appeal, lastly, to the words of the apostle in Tit. ii. 14. 'Jesus Christ,' says he, 'gave himself for us, that (ἵνα, to the end that) he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.' The apostle in this text clearly affirms that the Saviour died to redeem us from all iniquity, and to purify unto himself a peculiar people; but if it is confessedly the work of the Holy Ghost actually to regenerate and sanctify the depraved heart of man, is not this the same thing as to affirm that one of the great ends of his death was to secure the mission of the Spirit to purify their hearts by faith; or, in other words, to remove by his gracious agency those moral obstacles to salvation which exist in their mind as sinners against God?

(3.) Finally, in proof of the doctrine that Christ, by means of his death, secured, in regard to all who are saved, the mission of the Holy Ghost, to remove by his gracious agency those moral obstacles to salvation which exist in their minds as sinful beings, we appeal to those texts of scripture which affirm that the Spirit is actually given them for this purpose in consequence of Christ's death.

If, as we have just seen, one of the great ends for which Christ died was to secure for his people the gift of the Spirit in his saving influences, then it follows, unless his designs could be frustrated, that they must receive these influences, as an effect of his death. In proof of this, we appeal to his own testimony on this subject: 'But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send *in my name*, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.' (John xiv. 26.) Does not Christ in these words distinctly declare that the Father would send the Holy Ghost to teach his disciples, and to bring them to the saving knowledge of divine truth, 'in his name,' or on account of what he did and suffered for their redemption?

In proof of the same doctrine, we also appeal to the testimony which the apostle Peter gave to the Jews on the day of Pentecost. 'This Jesus,' says he, 'hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. *Therefore* being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear.' (Acts ii. 32, 33.) Does not Peter in this passage explicitly state, that the mission of the Spirit to convert sinners, and 'to add to the church daily such as should be saved,' was an effect of the resurrection of Christ as an event which proved, that in giving himself unto death for this

purpose, his sacrifice was accepted of the Father as the fulfilment of the condition on which the Holy Ghost was promised to him, and through him to 'as many as the Lord our God shall call'? This is evident from the word *therefore* (οὖν), for this conjunction does not merely express the grammatical connection of the sentences which precede and follow it, but also the connection between the things spoken of—that the one follows from the other, as effect from cause. Christ died and was raised from the grave, therefore, (consequently, for this cause,) he was exalted, and received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, and shed him forth not only in his miraculous gifts, but also in his saving influences.

And finally, in proof that the gift of the Spirit in his saving influences is an effect of Christ's death, we appeal to the words of the apostle Paul. 'Not by works of righteousness which we have done,' says he, 'but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly *through Jesus Christ our Saviour;* that, being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.' (Tit. iii. 5–7.) Does not the apostle in this passage plainly teach us, that the Holy Ghost is shed abundantly on sinners in his justifying and regenerating influences, and actually saves them, *through Jesus Christ;* that is, in consequence of the

mediatorial work of Christ, as its instrumental or intermediate cause?

On the whole, then, although it is the work of the Holy Spirit actually to remove, in the case of all who are saved, those moral obstacles which exist in their minds as sinful beings; yet, as the Spirit was promised by the Father to the Son as mediator, on the condition of his making his soul an offering for sin—as one of the great ends for which the Saviour died was to secure the promised presence and efficacious influences of the Spirit—and as the Spirit is actually given to regenerate all who are saved in consequence of Christ's death; does it not evidently follow, that his presence and agency in removing those moral obstacles that exist in their minds, are effects of his death, and must be ascribed to that event as their meritorious cause? To say that Christ died *merely* to remove those legal obstacles to salvation which have a relation to the character and law of God, and thus to render the salvation of all men possible, is to make a statement glaringly defective, and which is utterly incompatible with those texts of scripture that have been adduced in the preceding discussion; for these, as we have seen, plainly teach us that the Saviour has not only rendered the salvation of all men possible by means of his death, but that he has also thereby secured the mission and agency of the Holy Spirit, to regenerate and sanctify the hearts of his people, or, which is the same thing, to remove those moral obstacles to salva-

tion which have a relation to their state and character, and thus to render their salvation absolutely certain. Now, if both of these ends of the purpose of mercy were accomplished by means of Christ's death, how can any man who professes to regulate his belief by the Word of God, maintain that the Saviour, in dying, had no more speciality of design in regard to John, the beloved disciple, and those who shall be saved, than to Judas and those who shall be lost; or 'that the death of Christ has not secured the removal of the obstacles to salvation that are within sinners elected to eternal life?' Our opponents, to be consistent, should either abandon this theory, or deny that 'Christ was made a curse for us, that *we* (that is, Abraham's seed according to the promise, as the context shows) might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.' We leave the alternative to their choice.

6. That the Lord Jesus Christ infallibly secured, by means of his death, the salvation of a definite number of our race, is evident from the terms of the mediatorial law, which God promulgates amongst mankind by his word and ordinances for their salvation.

The mediatorial, like the Edenic dispensation, is a government of law and motives. Its laws and motives are contained and stated fully in the holy scriptures, and may be viewed as summarily comprehended in the words which Paul and Silas addressed to the Philippian

jailer, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved;' or in the words which Peter addressed to the Jews on the day of Pentecost, 'Repent, and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.'

The call of the gospel, which is contained in these and similar texts of scripture, consists in two things—a command and a promise. God commands all men to believe on Christ, and to repent of their sins, and promises salvation and the gift of the Holy Ghost to every sinner who yields obedience to these commandments. There is no restriction in the commands of the gospel call. The commandments, 'believe on the Lord Jesus Christ; repent, and be baptised,' are indiscriminately addressed to men as sinners, and to all men equally to whom the word of salvation is sent. In so far as these extend, there is no difference between those who are saved and those who are lost—all are alike under the same laws 'of repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ,' and equally bound to keep them. These commandments are not merely founded on the righteousness of Christ, as in its nature abstractly perfect and intrinsically sufficient for the salvation of all men; but also on that righteousness as the ordained means of establishing a dispensation of mercy amongst mankind, and of placing salvation within the reach of every sinner to whom the gospel is preached. Neither is there any restriction in the

promises of salvation, and of the gift of the Holy Ghost annexed to these commandments. Like the commands of the gospel call, these are indiscriminately addressed to every hearer of the gospel. God says to the wicked, however numerous or aggravated his transgressions may be, 'Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.' (Is. lv. 7.) In addressing sinners in these terms, God, however, does not absolutely promise to save them. He merely promises to have mercy upon them, and abundantly to pardon them, in the way of forsaking their wicked thoughts and actions, and of their returning to him in the exercise of faith and repentance. The promises of salvation and of the gift of the Holy Ghost, as annexed to the laws of the mediatorial dispensation, or call of the gospel, are simply, in this aspect of them, *motives* to obedience, and are addressed to sinners, and to all sinners alike, to induce them to repent of their sins, and to come to Christ that they may have life. In regard, therefore, both to the command, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ,' and the promise of salvation which is annexed to it as a motive to obedience, there is no restriction. Hence 'The Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely.'

Though, however, the command, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ,' and also the promise of salvation annexed to it as a motive to obedience, are both of unrestricted extent, yet it is evident, from the *nature* of the promise, that it does not secure the salvation of all those to whom the command is given, but the salvation of those only who give to him the obedience of faith. God does not promise to save all men. Had he done so, would he not have been bound by his faithfulness to fulfil his promise, and would not the human race, without exception, be eventually saved? On the contrary, God promises to save those only who hearken to his voice in the call of the gospel, and who obey him. In proof of this, we appeal to the following texts of scripture:—'Incline your ear,' says God, 'and come unto me: hear, and your soul shall live.' (Is. lv. 3.) 'If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. Whosever believeth on him shall not be ashamed. Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, shall be saved.' (Rom. x. 9, 11, 13.) 'He that covereth his sins shall not prosper, but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them, shall have mercy.' (Prov. xxviii. 13.) 'And we are his witnesses of these things, and so also is the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him.' (Acts v. 32.) It is plain, from these texts of scripture, that God does not promise to save all to whom

the word of salvation is sent, but only such of their number as hearken to his voice in the call of the gospel, and who, in obedience to that call, come to Christ that they may have life. Now, if God is faithful to his promise, if 'the Strength of Israel will not lie nor repent, for he is not a man that he should repent,' and if his promise 'is confirmed by an oath, that by two immutable things in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us,' does it not clearly follow that the salvation of every sinner, who by faith takes hold of God's covenant of promise, is an event absolutely certain? And, further, if 'all the promises of God in Christ are yea and in him amen,' if they are all made in him and fulfilled through his substitutionary death, does it not also follow that the salvation of every believer was infallibly secured by that event? The apostle Paul puts this view of the subject beyond a doubt, when he says that 'Christ, being made perfect, (that is, through suffering,) became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him.' (Heb. v. 9.)

On these principles, then, we conclude, from the very terms of the call of the gospel, as containing an absolute promise of salvation to all who obey it, that the design of Christ, in giving obedience unto death, was not merely to establish a dispensation of mercy amongst mankind, and to place sinners within the reach of pardon, but that it was also, and chiefly, his

design to secure the salvation of a definite portion of their number,—even of all those who would humbly and gratefully take hold of God's covenant of promise by faith.

On the whole, we submit to the reader whether these six arguments, which we have adduced in proof of the proposition, That the Lord Jesus Christ, by means of his death, has secured the actual salvation of a definite number of the human race from sin and misery, and their redemption unto God, do not clearly establish its truth? And, if so, whether they do not thoroughly subvert the theory of Dr Beman, and other theologians of the new school, that 'all that the atonement has done for the sinner is to place him within the reach of pardon?'

Explanatory Observations.

We might now proceed to the next topic of discussion; before, however, we do so, we crave the reader's attention to the three following observations, in farther elucidation of this important branch of the subject.

1. *The work of the Mediator, in so far as it secures the salvation of his people, has a special relation to God as a sovereign Benefactor.*

The work of Christ, in so far as it is the means by which the mediatorial form of government was established amongst mankind, has, as we have formerly seen, a reference to the character of God as a moral Governor; but in so far as it is the means by which

the salvation of a definite number of our race has been secured, it has a reference to his character as a sovereign Benefactor, or as the God of salvation,—who promised eternal life to believers in Christ Jesus, before the world began. The death of Christ is never to be viewed as an isolated event. It is a means to an end. It is inseparably connected with the divine purpose of mercy, and with that purpose as equally the purpose of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. And it is the condition of the covenant of grace, by means of which the ends of that purpose were secured, and are to be eventually realised. Now, if the Father in that covenant gave promises to the Son that he should obtain mediatorial power over all flesh, and that he should see his seed, on the condition of making his soul an offering for sin, is it not evident, that in giving obedience unto death he must have had a regard both to the general and special ends of the purpose of mercy, as these were set before him in the promises of the covenant, and also that he must have acted with a view to secure their accomplishment?

If, according to the purpose of the three persons of the Godhead, it was the design of the Father, as sustaining the majesty and rights of Deity in the economy of redemption, to place the fallen race of man under the mediatorial government of Christ, so that they might enjoy the external privileges of the gospel, and the means of salvation through him, and if this end could not be effected in consistency with the holi-

ness of his nature, and with those principles of equity on which his moral government is founded and administered, unless those legal obstacles which the sin of Adam had interposed between man and a dispensation of mercy had been removed; then, as the design of the Son must be the same with that of the Father, it follows that the Mediator must have given obedience unto death, as the Father's servant, in the nature of man, with the design of accomplishing this end, and, therefore, that his work, in this aspect of it, must have had a relation to God in his character as the righteous Lawgiver and Judge of man, and must have been designed 'not to make void the law, but to establish the law,' and to teach the intelligent universe that none can break with impunity its holy, and just, and good precepts.

In like manner, if, according to the purpose of the three persons in the Godhead, it was the gracious and special design of the Father to save those of the human race who would come to him through the Mediator, as the highest and ultimate end of the purpose of mercy in reference to man—if this end could not be obtained unless the native depravity of their minds, the enmity of their hearts toward God, and their unbelief were removed—and if in the transactions of the everlasting covenant the Father promised to send the Holy Ghost, called 'the promise of the Father,' to remove these moral obstacles, and thus to meeten them for the kingdom of heaven;

then, as the design of the Son must be the same with that of the Father, it follows that he must have died with the design 'of saving them by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost,' and therefore that his death, in this aspect of it, must have had a relation to the Father in his gracious character as the God of salvation, and who had promised to save those who believe in Jesus.

In proof that the death of Christ, in so far as it secured the removal of those moral obstacles to salvation which exist in the mind of the sinner himself, has a special relation to the character of God as the God of salvation, or to the promise of his covenant, we appeal to the words of the apostle, where he calls the blood of the Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, '*the blood of the everlasting covenant.*' (Heb. xiii. 20.) The everlasting covenant here spoken of is unquestionably the covenant of grace. The expression evidently refers to the revelation and establishment of this covenant with Abraham the father of the faithful, when God said to him, 'I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.' Now, if the apostle Paul, in interpreting this covenant of promise, declares 'that they which are of faith the same are the children of Abraham, and that the promise is sure to all the seed: not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who

is the father of us all' (Gal. iii. 7; Rom. iv. 16); and if he calls the blood of Christ, 'the blood of the everlasting covenant,' that is, the blood by which this covenant of promise was ratified; then it follows that his sacrifice, in so far as it secured the salvation of Abraham and of his spiritual offspring, must have had a relation to the promise, and have been offered to God, not in the character of a moral governor, but in that of a sovereign benefactor,—as the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, and of all who, like these patriarchs, should take hold of his covenant by faith.

In proof of this doctrine, we also appeal to the terms in which the Saviour, after his resurrection, announced that event to his disciples: 'Go to my brethren,' said he to Mary, 'and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God.' (John xx. 17.) In this message does not the risen Lord plainly intimate to his disciples that his death and resurrection have a relation to God in his economical character, as his Father and their Father, and as his God and their God, and that he has secured for them, by these works, the adoption of sons, and a participation with him in that glory and blessedness to which he was soon to be exalted in the kingdom of heaven, as their head and forerunner?

Finally, in proof of the same doctrine, we appeal to the terms which the Lord Jesus employs in describing the sacramental cup, that he appointed to be used in

the ordinance of the Supper. 'This cup,' says he, 'is the new covenant (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν) in my blood.' (1 Cor. xi. 25.) That is, this cup represents the new covenant as ratified by my death. The bread used in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper is the appointed symbol of Christ's body. This, says he concerning it, is, or represents, my body, which is broken for you. But it is a mistake to suppose that the cup represents the same thing; for Christ says concerning it, 'it is, or represents, the new covenant in my blood.' The cup, therefore, is not the symbol of Christ's death: but of the new covenant as ratified by that event. It is 'the cup of blessing.' The covenant of which the cup is the appointed token is the covenant of grace—the covenant which God at first revealed to our first parents in Eden, and more fully afterwards to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and in which he promised to be their God and the God of their believing posterity, and to bless in Christ all the nations of the earth. This covenant is called the *new* covenant, not because his death made any change either in its nature or in the saving blessings which it secures to believers; but in contradistinction to the Old Testament form of its administration, and because God, after the death of Christ, was no longer to dispense its blessings, through the sacrific ordinances of the Mosaic law, but through the instrumentality of the commemorative and more spiritual institutions of the New Testament economy.

Now if the sacramental cup represents the covenant of grace as ratified by the blood of Christ, then is it not evident that the death of Christ itself must have had a relation to that covenant? And further, if God, in the covenant, promises to bless in Christ and to save only them who believe, is it not also evident that his death, in conformity with these terms, must have secured pardon and eternal life to all who are Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise?

As the establishment of the mediatorial dispensation among men indiscriminately, as sinners, is accounted for on the principle that the obedience of Christ unto death, as the fulfilment of the law, had a relation to the character of God as a moral governor, and that it consequently removed those legal obstacles which stood between them and a dispensation of mercy; so as it appears to us, the actual redemption of all who are saved is to be accounted for on the principle that his obedience had a farther relation to the promise of the covenant given by God, as the God of salvation, and that it consequently secured the influences of the Spirit to remove those moral obstacles which existed in their minds, and which prevented them from entering into the kingdom of God, and from glorifying him in their bodies and in their spirits which are his.

2. *The work of the Mediator, in so far as it secures the salvation of his people, was and is performed by him in their name and as their representative.*

The work of Christ, in so far as it secures the salva-

tion of a definite number of our race, has not merely a reference to God in his gracious character as the God of salvation, or as having promised salvation to all who believe; but it has also a special reference to those of our race who take hold of his covenant of promise by faith; and was performed by him in their name and as their federal representative.

The Saviour, as we have already seen, did not obey the law of God for himself; for being a divine person, he did not naturally owe obedience unto God. Nor did he suffer and die for himself; for he was perfectly holy, and therefore not liable to suffering and death. His obedience and sufferings can be accounted for only on the principle that these were of a vicarious character, and that he acted as the representative of others: 'Messiah was cut off, but not for himself.'

The Saviour, as we have also seen, was not the representative of all men. His work, in so far as it placed all men under a dispensation of mercy, and thus placed salvation within their reach, was performed by him, not in his representative character, but in the nature of man and as the Father's servant. In becoming man, however, he merely took on him the same nature as ours. There was no substitution of one nature in the room of a different nature. The representative relation, therefore, which consists in placing one person in the room of another so as to act for his interests, and which can be formed only between persons and not between natures, is neces-

sarily precluded from this aspect of the character and work of Christ. Besides, if he had been the representative of all men, would not all men have been saved; for either the good or evil results of the acts of a representative extend to all those, without exception, who are represented by him? And further, if when an Israelite, under the typical dispensation, offered a sacrifice, according to the law, as his substitute, the penalty due to his transgression was not executed on himself, for God said, 'his sin shall be forgiven him;' would it not be incongruous to suppose that the antitypical sacrifice of Christ had not secured the enjoyment of pardon to all men, if he had died as the substitute or the representative of the race?

But the Saviour was the representative of those who were given to him of the Father, or of those of the human family who shall believe on his name. As we have already endeavoured to prove the truth of this doctrine in a preceding chapter, to which we beg to refer the reader, we shall not here farther resume the subject than to observe, That the extent of Christ's death, in regard to its saving designs and results, and consequently that the extent of his representation, is determined by the will of God as revealed, not *in the command* of the gospel call, which is universal and obligatory on all men, but *in the promise* of salvation annexed to that call, which is fulfilled only in those who believe on the Lord Jesus Christ in obedience to that commandment.

The truth of this observation is evident from the fact, that the sacrifices and many other rites of the ceremonial law had a relation to the promises of the covenant of grace. For example, had not the rite of circumcision a relation to the promise which God gave to Abraham, saying, 'I will be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee?' Had not the blood of the paschal lamb, as sprinkled on the two side-posts and on the upper door-post of the houses of the Israelites in Egypt, a relation to God's promise: 'When I see the blood, I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you, when I smite the land of Egypt?' Had not the sin-offerings under the law for sins of ignorance a reference to God's promise of pardon; for when scripturally presented God said, 'It shall be forgiven them?' And, in like manner, had not the services of the high priest, on the great day of atonement, in killing the goat of the sin-offering, in sprinkling its blood within the vail before the Lord, in putting by confession the iniquities of the children of Israel upon the head of the live goat, and in sending him away into the wilderness, a reference to the same promise: 'For on that day,' says God, 'shall the priest make an atonement for you to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord?' If, then, the sacrifices of the typical dispensation had thus a relation to the promises of God's covenant, and were to be offered as a means of obtaining promised blessings, are we not warranted

to conclude that the antitypical sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ must have had a similar relation to the promises of the covenant, and was offered by him for the purpose of saving only those who believe? The truth of this conclusion is clearly established by the testimony of the apostle Paul. 'If the inheritance be of the law,' says he, 'it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise. Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made. . . . But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.' (Gal. iii. 18, 19, 22.) The apostle in this passage evidently affirms that the law was added to the promise. The promise here spoken of is the promise of the heavenly inheritance, and which in the fourteenth verse he calls 'the blessing of Abraham, and the promise of the Spirit.' The law referred to is confessedly the Sinaitic law. As that law, however, included the law of sacrifice as well as the moral law, therefore in saying it was added to the promise, he thereby teaches us, amongst other lessons, that the typical sacrifices of the former dispensation had a relation to the promise, and consequently that the antitypical sacrifice of Christ must have had a similar connection. If, then, the sacrifice of Christ had a relation to the promise, does it not plainly follow, that its efficacy and saving results are determined by the grace of God as revealed in

the promise, and not by his equity as manifested in the law? And further, if God in the covenant which he established with Abraham promised to save only those who believe, does it not also follow, that the sacrifice of Christ, in this aspect of it, must have been offered up to God by him, with the intention of accomplishing this end,—'that,' as the apostle adds, 'the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given *to them that believe?*'

That the extent of Christ's death, in regard to its efficacy and saving results, is determined by the will of God as revealed, not in the commands, but in the promises of his covenant, is further evident from the manner in which God dispenses its blessings to men, through the ordinances of his grace. 'God hath set forth Christ Jesus,' says Paul, 'to be a propitiation *through faith in his blood.*' (Rom. iii. 25.) In this text the apostle declares that the blood of Christ, as shed and sprinkled before the Lord, is set forth in the dispensation of the gospel indiscriminately to sinners, as that which propitiates the Deity and actually turns away his anger, not from all men, but only from those of the race who believe the promise, and who put their trust in Christ, as that great high priest who shed his blood, that whosoever believeth in him, should, according to the promise, receive remission of sins.

Now if, according to these texts, God, in the covenant of grace, promises to save only those who believe, and if the sacrifice of Christ, in regard to its

efficacy and saving results, had a relation to the promise, are we not warranted to conclude, in consequence of this relationship, that the extent of his representation is determined by the nature of the promise, and that he died as the covenant representative only of those of the human race who would take hold of God's covenant by faith, and with the intention of bringing these his many sons and daughters unto glory? It is a covenant in every case which constitutes a representative character, and which determines the number of persons whose interests shall be affected either for good or evil by his deeds as a representative.

The death of Christ, in his character as the representative of all who shall be saved through faith in his blood as the blood of the covenant, is to be accounted for on the principle that their transgressions were imputed to him. The truth of this doctrine is evident from the following texts of scripture:—'He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we, like sheep, have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.' (Is. liii. 5, 6.) 'He his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed.' (1 Peter ii. 24.) These and similar texts of scripture un-

doubtedly teach us, that the sins of those 'who are healed with Christ's stripes, and who live unto righteousness,' were imputed to him. The imputation of our sins to the holy Lamb of God is the only principle on which his sufferings and death can be satisfactorily accounted for.

When we affirm that our sins were imputed to Christ, we do not mean that they were imputed to him on the principle of equity, but on the principle of sovereignty;—because he voluntarily consented to become our surety. No sin can be equitably imputed to any moral agent unless it is in some sense his deed. 'It would be inconsistent with truth if God were to impute that to a sinner which did not belong to him —to count that ours which is not so in reality. There are only two classes of deeds that belong to us, and that can properly be called our deeds—*first*, Those deeds which we actually perform by our personal agency; *secondly*, Those deeds which we legally perform by the agency of a representative. Both of these kind of deeds are imputable to men because they are their deeds; but no other deeds can be imputed to them, because no other deeds except those which belong to one or other of these classes can be their deeds.'—(Edenic Dispensation, p. 260.) Now the sins of men *as deeds* cannot be imputed to the Saviour either on the one or other of these principles; for these are not his deeds personally, but exclusively their own; nor did they, in committing them, sustain

any relation whatsoever to him as his representatives. Sovereign grace, therefore, is the only principle on which we can account for the imputation of our sins to the Lord Jesus Christ. Hence the scriptures teach us that he became the surety of the covenant, and did 'bear the sins of many,' solely in consequence of his own gracious and voluntary consent. 'Lo,' says he, 'I come to do thy will, O God.'

Neither when we say that our sins were imputed to Christ do we mean that they were imputed to him in their criminality or blame-worthiness. This is evidently a corollary from the foregoing proposition. If our sins do not in any sense belong to Christ as deeds, but are exclusively our own acts, then the culpability and blame-worthiness of them must rest entirely and for ever with ourselves. There could be no actual transference of our character as sinful beings to the Holy One of God, nor could our evil thoughts, volitions and actions, *as crimes*, ever be imputed to the Saviour as our surety.

But when we affirm that our sins were imputed to Christ, we simply mean that the Father, in consequence of his voluntary engagement to act as our representative, according to the arrangements of the covenant of grace, treated him as if he had been the transgressor. 'The word impute, when used in reference to those acts which are done by men, either personally or by the agency of a representative, includes,' as we have elsewhere shown, 'as the *primary*

idea, that the acts imputed have been done by them, and are their acts; and as the *secondary* and consequent idea that they shall be treated according to these acts as good or evil. But when used in reference to that which is done by persons who voluntarily become surety for others, it includes only the *secondary and accessory* idea; namely, that the offended party should treat them not as persons who have transgressed either personally or by a representative agent, but as if they had been the transgressors.'—(Edenic Dispensation. Note on the nature of imputation, pp. 247–274.) Now, if the imputation of our sins to Christ is founded not on the false principle that these belonged to him either personally or by representation, but on the principle of his own gracious and spontaneous consent, then it follows, that in voluntarily consenting to become our surety, and to have our sins imputed to him, he merely agreed to take upon him our legal responsibilities as sinners against God—that is, to bear the penal consequences of our transgressions, and to yield perfect obedience to the law of God in our name and for our interests, that we on equitable principles might receive gratuitously deliverance from condemnation and the justification of life. The most high God, in imputing our sins to Christ, held him merely responsible to do and to suffer all things that law and justice demanded for our eternal salvation.

The suretyship of Christ is another of those prin-

ciples on which the efficacy of his death, in removing those moral obstacles which exist in the minds of sinners, is to be accounted for. If the Saviour acted in all that he did and suffered in a representative character,—if the sins of his people were imputed to him,—and if he was wounded for their transgressions; or if, according to the words of an apostle, 'he was made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons:' then it is evident, from the very nature of the representative relation, that these blessings must have been secured by his death to all whom he represented. The deeds of a representative, whether good or evil, invariably extend in their results to those who are represented by him. For example, the sin of Adam under the Edenic dispensation, produced evil consequences in regard to the entire race of man, because under that dispensation he was appointed to act in their name and for their interests. But Adam was in this respect as the apostle Paul declares, and as we have elsewhere shown, 'the figure (τύπος, the type) of him that was to come.'—(Edenic Dispensation, p. 39.) Now, if Adam, as a representative character, was the type of Christ, then it follows that Christ, as the second Adam, must also have sustained a representative character, and that his obedience unto death must have produced saving results in regard to all those who were included in the covenant of grace, just as the sin of Adam produced penal

effects in regard to those who were included in the covenant of works. The representative character both of Adam and of Christ, is the principle on which the apostle accounts for the universal sinfulness and condemnation of the race on the one hand, and for the justification unto life of those who believe in Jesus on the other. 'As by one man's disobedience,' says he, 'many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.'

3. *The work of Jesus Christ, in so far as it secures the salvation of his people, has a connection with their personal agency as subjects of his mediatorial government.*

The work of Christ, in regard to the salvation of infants, can obviously have no connection with their personal exertions; for how could they do anything to obtain this blessing prior to the commencement of their moral agency? The scriptures, however, clearly teach us that no adult sinner is warranted to expect salvation irrespective of his own agency, and unless he put forth his energies as placed under the mediatorial government of Christ, for the attainment of this invaluable boon. According to the arrangements of the covenant of grace, there is a distinct province within which sinners are to 'work out their own salvation with fear and trembling.' What, then, is that province? It cannot be the province marked out in the plan of redemption for divine agency. No place can be found for the efforts of man in that province. No man can do those works which are pecu-

liar to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and which have been, or are done by them for the salvation of sinners.

The agency of man obviously can have no place in the work which the Father has performed in sending his Son into the world, to do and to suffer those things which were necessary for the accomplishment of the general and special ends of the purpose of mercy—the establishment of the mediatorial dispensation amongst mankind, and the salvation of all who believe. Was it not God the Father exclusively 'who sent his only-begotten Son into the world that we might live through him?' Neither can the agency of man have any place in the work which the Son, as sent by the Father, accomplished for the attainment of these ends. Was it not Christ alone 'who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness?' Nor can the agency of man have any place in the work which the Son of God performed in the establishment of the mediatorial dispensation amongst men, on the ground of his death, viewed either as a future or past event. Was it not the Mediator alone who revealed the purpose of mercy to fallen man in the garden of Eden, and who established amongst the race a system of religious institutions for its accomplishment? Was it not the Angel of the Covenant who revealed his will to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, and who promised 'to be a God unto them

and to their seed after them?' Was it not the Redeemer of the church who came down upon mount Sinai, on the top of the mountain, and who 'spake unto the children of Israel out of the midst of fire, and declared unto them his covenant, which he commanded them to perform, even ten commandments, and wrote them upon two tables of stone?' Was it not the Lord Jesus Christ who abolished the typical institutions of the Mosaic dispensation, and who established in his church the ordinances of the New Testament economy, and introduced that ministration of the Spirit which excelleth in glory, and with which the world shall be blessed till the end of time? Nor can the agency of man have any place in the work which the Holy Ghost performs in the economy of redemption, in so far as he thereby bestows on men the external means of salvation. God indeed employs the agency of man in preserving, translating and circulating the holy scriptures, in disseminating the gospel throughout the world, and in transmitting the knowledge of his name as the God of salvation from age to age; but the revelation of the will of God, for our salvation and our actual enjoyment of the external means of grace, must be ascribed to the sovereign goodness of the Holy Spirit. Is it not written, that 'prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost?' And is it not also written that Paul and Timothy 'were forbidden of the Holy Ghost

to preach the word in Asia, and when they assayed to go into Bithynia the Spirit suffered them not?' The word of salvation must be sent to us by God, ere we can acquire a knowledge of the way of salvation, through faith in Christ Jesus. No man has control over the place of his birth, whether he shall be born in a land favoured with the means of salvation or otherwise, therefore the enjoyment or non-enjoyment of gospel privileges and of the external means of grace, cannot be the result of his personal agency, but of the righteous arrangements of the God of providence. Nor can the agency of man have any place in the work of the Holy Ghost, in so far as he gives efficacy to the gospel, and regenerates the soul of sinners through its instrumentality. Is it not exclusively the work of the Spirit to quicken the soul which is dead in trespasses and sins? 'Of his own will,' says the apostle James, 'begat he us with the word of truth.' 'It is,' says Christ, 'the Spirit that quickeneth.'

In the economy of redemption, the province assigned for the agency of man is that of the instituted and ordinary means of grace, namely, 'the word, sacraments, and prayer.' 'To escape the wrath and curse of God due to us for sin, God requireth of us faith in Jesus Christ, repentance unto life, with the diligent use of all the outward means whereby Christ communicateth to us the benefits of redemption.' In the administration of that economy, though it is the peculiar work of the Spirit to favour sinners in-

discriminately with the outward means of salvation, and also to give efficacy to these means in the case of all who are saved; yet it would be manifestly absurd to conclude from these premises that the agency of the sinner himself was in no sense necessary to the salvation of his soul. On the contrary, is it not evident, from the very nature of the Spirit's work in favouring men with the means of salvation, and in giving efficacy to them, that it must be the duty of sinners, as thus placed under the mediatorial government of Christ, conscientiously to observe these means, and to seek from God, through their instrumentality, those gracious influences of the Spirit which are necessary to incline their hearts to come to Christ that they might have life? Where would be the wisdom of God in sending the gospel to men, and in promising the Spirit to influence their will to make choice of Christ as their Saviour, if their *consent* were not required to a participation of the benefits of his suretyship?

It appears to be the will of God that no adult sinner shall actually enjoy the benefits which result from Christ's death, as the representative of his people, *without his personal consent*. Our consent is indeed not necessary either to the constitution of the representative character of Christ, or to the performance of his substitutionary services; for the former was assumed and the latter performed ere we had existence or were capable of yielding assent to these things; but according to

the arrangements of the covenant, our consent is necessary to an actual participation in the benefits which result from the work that he performed in our name and for our interests. If it were otherwise, how could sinners be required to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ that they might be saved? How could faith be spoken of in the scriptures as that grace of the Spirit which actually unites them to Christ, in his representative character as the moral Head of his body, the church, and by which they receive, through imputation, the saving results of his righteousness? And how could an apostle say to the christians of Galatia, 'ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus?' Sinners are not saved against their will. 'I drew them,' says God concerning his people, 'with cords of a man, with bands of love; and I was to them as they that take off the yoke on their jaws, and I laid meat unto them.' And 'thy people,' says the Psalmist, 'shall be willing in the day of thy power.'

Under the mediatorial dispensation, as a form of moral government, the Most High deals with men as rational and accountable agents. He governs them by laws and motives. He sends his gospel to them, and establishes his ordinances amongst them, to enlighten their minds in the knowledge of Christ, to renew their wills, and to influence them to make choice of Jesus as their Saviour;—he commands all to hearken to his voice in the gospel, and to observe

the ordinances of his worship as the outward means of salvation, that they may believe in Christ and be ultimately saved;—and he promises actually to regenerate and save those who come to him through Christ in the way appointed in his word. Under the mediatorial government God does not command the sinner to do things which he is naturally or physically unable to perform. He does not command him to do those things which fall within the province of divine agency; but merely those things which lie within the province which he has assigned for the agency of man. He does not command him to work out a righteousness as the ground of justification in his sight, or to remove those legal obstacles which stand between him and salvation; for this was the work assigned to the Son of God, and which he fully accomplished when he gave obedience unto death, in the nature of man and as the Father's servant. Nor does he command the sinner to remove those moral obstacles of native depravity, of ignorance, and of unbelief, which exist in his heart, or to regenerate himself; for Christ also died to secure the removal of this class of obstacles, and actually accomplishes this end in the administration of the mediatorial economy, 'by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.' But God commands him to attend to the gospel, and to observe all the means of grace which he has appointed for regenerating the soul of man, and which he employs in

effecting this object. Having placed men, as fallen beings, under the mediatorial form of government, and given them the means of salvation, he commands them, as under the curse, to consider the position to which his goodness has raised them, and to seek deliverance from death and the forfeited blessing of eternal life through Christ Jesus. Having given men, as born and living in a state of ignorance, a revelation of his will in the holy scriptures for their salvation, he commands them, as rational beings, to 'search the scriptures; for in them they have eternal life: and they are they which testify of Christ.' Having favoured them with the instituted ordinances of salvation, he commands them, as the subjects of his government, to observe these conscientiously, as means of their communion with God and preparation for heaven. Having revealed himself in his word and ordinances as the God of mercy, he commands them, as sinful beings, to seek through this instrumentality the pardon of their transgressions and the sanctification of their hearts in the name of Christ, that they may be delivered from perdition and meetened for heaven. And having set before men, as voluntary and accountable agents, the most powerful motives to induce them to improve their gospel privileges, he commands them not to resist these, but to yield to their influence, and thus give the assent of the understanding and the consent of the heart to the testimony of his grace, — or to

believe on the Lord Jesus Christ that they may be saved.

In issuing these commands, God enjoins nothing on sinners but what, as rational, and voluntary, and active agents, they are able to perform. Can they not enter this province of moral industry, and labour there in the use of means, not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto them? Can they not read the scriptures, and meditate on spiritual things? Can they not go to the house of God, and hear the gospel, and observe the public and private and secret ordinances of divine worship? And can they not pray to God for the Spirit to crown these means of grace, and their agency in observing them, with his blessing,—that they may believe to the saving of their souls? Does not consciousness testify to every sinner that he has power to do these things if he choose? Let no man, therefore, say, I can do nothing to obtain the salvation of God. Is not this language a libel on the nature of man, as a being endowed with powers of intelligence, of volition, and of action? And would it not be an impeachment of the wisdom of God in appointing ordinances of salvation, and in commanding sinners to observe them? It is equally unreasonable to say that man can do nothing to obtain the meat which endureth unto everlasting life, as to affirm that he can do nothing to obtain the meat which perisheth. We

are to labour in the use of means for both. And it is as certain in regard to moral as physical industry, 'that the hand of the diligent maketh rich.' We can, indeed, do nothing to merit salvation, for, when we have done all those things which are commanded us, Christ tells us to say, 'We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do.' But we can do something that we may receive and enjoy the salvation of God. We can use the means which God hath appointed for its attainment. If, then, sinners neglect or refuse to use the means of salvation which God bestows upon them, and to do what they can,—if they shall rebel against the word of God, and contemn the counsel of the Most High, shall not their future condemnation and final perdition be entirely the results of their own folly, in choosing to walk in their own counsels in preference to the counsels of Infinite Wisdom, and a just retribution of their sins, in that they hated knowledge, and did not choose the fear of the Lord? 'They would none of my counsel; they despised all my reproof,' saith the Lord, 'therefore shall they eat the fruit of their own way, and be filled with their own devices.'

It may be argued by some, in opposition to this view of the subject, that as God in the gospel commands sinners to believe on Christ that they may be saved; that, therefore, in issuing such a command, he requires them to perform an act which lies beyond the province of means and of man's ability, since the

scriptures affirm that 'faith is the fruit of the Spirit' (Gal. v. 22); and consequently that they are not responsible for their unbelief. We admit the truth of the premises stated in this objection, but deny the conclusions drawn from them. It is undeniably true that God commands all sinners to whom the gospel is sent to believe his testimony concerning Christ, and that this is the duty of every man. Faith in God is the immutable law of nature, and all rational beings, in every condition of their existence, are bound to believe his testimony as the faithful Jehovah. The sin of man has not and could not annul any of the natural laws of the divine government. Notwithstanding of the fall, it is just in God to command all men to believe his testimony concerning Christ, and all men are still bound to give him 'the obedience of faith.' It is also true that 'faith is the fruit of the Spirit,' or the effect of his operation on the mind. As sinners, we have no moral strength to change the disposition of our depraved hearts, so that we may believe in Christ. 'No man can come to me,' says Christ, 'except the Father which hath sent me draw him.' Though, however, we cannot effect this change of ourselves, yet Christ, who is the Lord our strength as truly as the Lord our righteousness, (Is. xlv. 24,) in his state of humiliation died to secure the Spirit to change the disposition of our heart;—in his state of exaltation he promises the Spirit for this purpose, saying, 'A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit

will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh; and I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes: and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them;'—and in the day of effectual calling he actually gives the Spirit to effect this change upon the heart: 'For,' says an apostle, 'it is God which worketh *in you*, both *to will* and to do of his good pleasure.' According to these texts it is obviously not the work of God to believe for men, for faith is the act of their own mind; but it is his work to change the heart, so that they, as voluntary agents, shall yield to the influence of those motives which are objectively presented to their view in the gospel, and believe in his name, and obey him according to his commandments. When, therefore, God commands sinners to believe on Christ, he does not command them to change the disposition of their depraved hearts, because this is a work which lies within the province of divine agency, and which, as without moral strength, they are incompetent to perform; but he commands them, as rational beings, and as placed under the mediatorial form of government, to use those means of grace by which the Spirit produces this change on the heart, that through this instrumentality they may obtain faith as 'a fruit of the Spirit,' and actually believe on Christ that they may be saved.

Faith in Christ is to be viewed in two aspects. *First*, In reference to the salvation of the soul; and in

this aspect it is a means to the attainment of this end. Hence says the apostle Peter to believers, 'Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls.' (1 Pet. i. 9.) *Secondly*, In reference to the scriptures and the ordinances of divine grace; and in this aspect it is an end to which these means are subservient. Hence says the apostle John, 'These things are written that (ἵνα, to the end that) ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, and that (ἵνα, to the end that) believing ye might have life through his name.' (John xx. 31.) And hence also the apostle Paul tells us that 'faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.' (Rom. x. 17.) These texts unquestionably teach us, that faith in Christ is the proximate end to which the gospel is subservient, and that sinners are brought to believe in his name through its instrumentality. If, then, faith is the proximate end to which the scriptures and ordinances of divine grace, as means, are subservient, it is evident that the command, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ,' must have a reference to these means, and, consequently, that it must place sinners under an obligation to live in the use of them that they may obtain faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. And it is further evident, that God, in issuing this commandment, in so far as it has a reference to the word and ordinances of his grace as means appointed for the attainment of faith, does not require sinners to do anything which lies within the province of divine agency, and which they are unable to perform;

but that, on the contrary, he requires them only to do those things which lie within the province of human agency, namely, to use the means of grace, *first*, to the end that 'they may believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God;' and *secondly*, to the end that 'believing they may have life through his name.'

Faith in Christ is, however, the fruit of the Spirit, not only because he gives sinners an objective revelation of the truth to be believed, and furnishes them with the outward means of obtaining it, but also because he subjectively operates on the mind and disposes them to believe on Christ that they may be saved. The subjective operation of the Spirit upon the soul, enlightening the understanding in the knowledge of Christ, and disposing the heart to receive the love of the truth, is as necessary to the existence and exercise of this christian virtue, as the objective revelation of the truth itself. The Lord must 'open our understanding that we may understand the scriptures.' And he must also open our hearts, as he did Lydia's of old, that we may attend to the things which are spoken to us of the Lord, ere we will believe on Christ to the saving of the soul. Now the objection, that God, in commanding sinners to believe in Christ, thereby requires them to perform an act which lies beyond the province of means, and therefore of man's ability, is equally groundless in regard to this view of the subject, as it is in reference to the former. For though the subjective influences of

the Spirit are necessary to dispose sinners to believe on Christ, yet these are promised by God, and shall be given to those who seek them from him by means of prayer and supplication: 'Behold,' says he, 'I will pour out my Spirit unto you; I will make known my words unto you.' (Prov. i. 23.) 'If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father,' says Christ, 'will he give him a stone? or if he ask a fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent? or if he shall ask an egg, will he offer him a scorpion? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more will your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?' (Luke xi. 11–13.) 'The Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him,' says Paul; 'for whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.' (Rom. x. 12, 13.) These passages of sacred writ teach us that God is willing to give the Spirit to those who ask him, and far more ready to do so than the most loving father is to bestow good things on his children;—that it is man's duty to pray for the Spirit;—and that every sinner who seeks the Spirit by prayer to regenerate his soul and dispose him to believe on Christ for salvation, shall receive this promise of the Father.

When therefore God commands sinners to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, he does not command them to make the vain attempt of regenerating their own carnal mind; for this is a work which lies within the province of divine agency, and which the Spirit only

can accomplish; but he commands them to enter the province of means which he has assigned for human agency, and to seek the Spirit by prayer to do that for them which they cannot do for themselves—'to fulfil in them all the good pleasure of his goodness, and the work of faith with power.' According to the arrangements of the covenant of grace, the enjoyment of the saving influence of the Spirit stands connected with the goodness of God in placing men under the mediatorial form of government, and with their agency, as rational and accountable beings, in observing the ordinances of that economy, as 'the outward and ordinary means whereby Christ communicateth to us the benefits of redemption.' Since, then, God in the gospel gives men not only an objective revelation of the truth as it is in Jesus, but also promises the Spirit to those who ask him, to operate subjectively on the mind, and thus dispose them to believe on Christ, it is evident that there are no insuperable barriers in the way of sinners to prevent them from 'coming to Christ that they might have life.'

How, then, is it that so many hearers of the gospel remain in a state of unbelief? It cannot be because they do not know what to believe; for God has favoured them in the word and ordinances of his grace with a revelation of Christ, and of the way of salvation through faith in his name. It cannot be because no motives are set before their minds to

induce them to come to Christ that they may be saved; for God has promised everlasting life as the reward of faith, and threatened everlasting death as the penalty of unbelief. It cannot be because they are naturally depraved and unable to regenerate themselves; for God has promised 'to put his Spirit within them,' to operate subjectively on the mind, and to renew the heart of those who seek him by prayer and in the observance of the other means of grace. But it is because they either neglect or refuse to give that attention to the gospel which its importance and interest demand of them, and which, as endowed with understanding and reason, they are able to bestow on it. It is because they perversely disregard the motives of life and of death which the gospel presents to influence the will, and which, as endowed with powers of perception and volition, they ought to consider and yield to. It is because, in the pride of their heart, they will not humble themselves to observe the means of grace and pray for the Spirit to regenerate and save them, according to the commands and counsels of Infinite Wisdom, and which, as animated with a desire of happiness, they should labour to obtain in preference to all things besides. Shall not, therefore, those hearers of the gospel who do not believe on Christ, be constrained to ascribe their unbelief and subsequent loss of the soul not to anything, either in the nature or administration of the mediatorial economy, under which Provi-

dence had benevolently placed them, but exclusively to their own wilful negligence and perversity of disposition in refusing to put forth their agency in the use of means that they might lay hold of eternal life—in putting from them, like the Jews at Antioch, the word of God which was spoken to them —and in judging themselves unworthy of everlasting life?

Now, if God has instituted means of salvation, and if, as we have shown under this observation, he actually saves adult sinners in connection with their personal agency in the use of these means, then it follows that he must have purposed to save them through means, and their personal agency in the use of them; for, according to one of the maxims on the subject of divine decrees, God purposes all he does, and does all that he purposes. And it also follows, that the death of Christ, in so far as it secures the salvation of his people, must have had a reference to their personal agency, as placed under the mediatorial form of government; or, in other words, that it must have been the design of the Son of God, in offering the sacrifice of himself, to give eternal life to those only who should come unto God through him, in the use of the appointed means of salvation; for his design, or purpose, as one of the persons of the Godhead, is necessarily the same with that of the Father and of the Holy Ghost. The truth of these conclusions is established by the following texts of scripture:—'We

are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit, *and belief of the truth*.' (2 Thess. ii. 13.) 'Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, *through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience* and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.' (1 Pet. i. 2.) 'Wherefore Jesus is able to save them to the uttermost *that come unto God by him*, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.' (Heb. vii. 25.)

On the whole, in this section we have endeavoured to prove, *first*, that the Lord Jesus Christ, by means of his obedience unto death, secured the establishment of the mediatorial form of moral government, amongst the human race indiscriminately, and the promulgation of the law of faith, in his name, as the rule by which the conduct of every man ought to be regulated. And, *secondly*, that he also secured, by the same means, the actual salvation of a definite number of the human race from sin and misery, and their redemption unto God. These were the two great objects of the purpose of mercy in its aspects to man, and both of them have been accomplished by means of the death of Jesus Christ our Lord.

Some theologians of the old school, as they have been called, refuse to admit that the death of Christ has any general reference or benevolent aspect to the human race. 'There is,' say the Associate Synod, in

the act concerning Arminian errors, 'but *one special redemption*, by the death of Christ, for all the objects thereof; as he died in *one and the same respect* for all those for whom he in *any respect* died.'—(Gib's Display, vol. ii. p. 139.) Theologians of the new school, on the contrary, refuse to admit that the Saviour, in dying, had any speciality of intention to one class of men more than to another,—and that his death secured the influences of the Spirit to regenerate and save any definite number of the race; and maintain that he died equally for Judas as for Peter and Paul,—and that his death simply opened the door of mercy to all, and placed them within the reach of pardon. 'All that the atonement has done for the sinner,' says Dr Beman, 'is to place him within the reach of pardon.'—(Dr Beman, Christ the Only Sacrifice, p. 137.) Now, neither of these theories, in regard to the death of Christ, meets all the facts of the case, as we have endeavoured to show, nor furnishes us with the means of explaining those passages of scripture which speak of that death in its general reference to the world, and in its special reference to God's elect. And, therefore, both ought to be set aside as defective and unscriptural. But if the theory advocated in these pages is admitted; if Christ died, *first*, with the intention of placing the whole human race under the mediatorial form of government, and of calling sinners indiscriminately, by means of his word and Spirit, to turn to the Lord that he may have mercy on them;

and if he died, *secondly*, with the intention of securing the actual salvation of a definite portion of their number, even those who shall hearken to his voice, and come to the Father by him; then both the free and indiscriminate call of the gospel, and also the salvation of God's people, as an event absolutely certain, are satisfactorily accounted for. This theory obviously furnishes us with a key to explain, easily and consistently, those passages of scripture which speak of the death of Christ in relation to the world, and also those which speak of it in relation to God's elect. But this brings us to the consideration of the question regarding the extent of Christ's death.

VI. *The Extent of the Death of Christ.*

As this treatise has already exceeded the limits at first contemplated, we shall, in this and the following sections, do little more than give a brief outline of the subjects which remain to be considered, and which might otherwise have been more fully discussed.

The question regarding the extent of the death of Christ, is not, Is the atonement universal or particular? The word atonement, unhappily, has been used by most theologians in opposition both to its etymological and scriptural meaning, to denote the death of Christ itself, and hence the question respecting the extent of the death of Christ has often been confounded with that respecting the extent of the atonement. The confounding of these two distinct things, the death of

Christ and the atonement, has occasioned, we are persuaded, much confusion of thought and inaccuracy of statement, in the mind and writings of many theologians on this important subject. Atonement, as we have formerly shown, is not a description of the nature of the death of Christ, but is one of the effects which result from it. It denotes that state of reconciliation —at-one-ment, or agreement with God—which results from God in Christ turning away his anger from sinners, and not imputing their trespasses unto them, and from their faith in his testimony concerning Christ, as the word of reconciliation. Those only 'who are justified by faith,' says the apostle Paul, 'have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ,' or are in a state of at-one-ment and agreement with him. It is evident, therefore, from the very nature of atonement, and from the undeniable fact that many of those to whom the word of salvation is sent are not reconciled to God, but remain 'enemies to him in their mind by wicked works,' that the atonement is not universal but particular,—being commensurate in its extent, not with the promulgation of the gospel, but with its saving results.

But the question is, Has the sacrificial death of Christ a relation to all men? or only to a definite number of the race? or to both? In other words, for whom and for what purposes did Christ die?

'The theories or schemes' respecting the death of Christ, says Dr Wardlaw, 'are three in number. The

first is the theory of EXACT EQUIVALENT; the second the theory of INFINITE SUFFICIENCY, but DEFINITE INTENTION, or LIMITED DESTINATION; and the third that of INDEFINITE or UNIVERSAL atonement, with GRACIOUS SOVEREIGNTY IN ITS EFFECTUAL APPLICATION.'—(Dr Wardlaw's Discourses on the Nature and Extent of the Atonement, p. 61.)

1. The *first* is 'the theory of exact equivalent.' According to this scheme Christ suffered just so much of the wrath of God as those who shall be saved deserved to suffer; and his sufferings would have been proportionally greater if more than the elect were to have been saved. This theory is flagrantly inconsistent with the view which the scriptures give us of the obedience of Christ unto death as absolutely perfect, for it supposes that something may be added to perfection; and also with the view which they give us of that obedience as of infinite value, being the obedience of a divine person in the human nature; for it sets limits to infinity. Besides, it is utterly incompatible with the call of the gospel as addressed indiscriminately to sinners of the human race. On these principles it must be rejected as an unscriptural theory.

2. The *second* theory regarding the death of Christ is that 'of infinite sufficiency, but definite intention, or limited destination.' According to this scheme, as stated by Dr Symington, 'The Lord Jesus Christ made atonement to God by his death only for the

sins of those to whom, in the sovereign good pleasure of the Almighty, the benefit of his death shall be finally applied.'—(Dr William Symington on the Atonement, p. 237.) This is the theory which Dr Symington and other eminent Calvinistic divines have adopted. We, however, are constrained to object to it; because it is defective, and does not state the whole truth on the subject. It plainly restricts the intention of Christ in laying down his life to that definite number of the human race who shall eventually be brought to glory; though, at the same time, the infinite worth of his sacrifice and its sufficiency for the salvation of all men are distinctly avowed and maintained. It is unquestionably true, that Christ died with the special intention of saving his people from their sins, and that this was the chief design of his death in regard to man; but it is equally true, as we have seen, that he died also to place the whole human race under the mediatorial dispensation of mercy, and to render salvation available to all men. Now, if Christ died for the attainment both of the special and general ends of the purpose of mercy, it is evident that a theory which restricts his death to the former to the exclusion of the latter, must be essentially defective, and cannot be the true one. It does not meet all the facts of the case, or furnish ground for the satisfactory explanation of them. We object, therefore, to this theory regarding the death of Christ, because it ignores the general reference which it has to the whole human race, and

restricts it to one special end—the salvation of God's elect. No doubt Dr Symington and its other advocates firmly maintain that 'The death of Christ is sufficient for all, and that this all-sufficiency is what lays foundation for the unrestricted universality of the gospel call.' — (Dr Symington on the Atonement, p. 239.) But, according to this theory, the unrestricted universality of that call is evidently not founded on any benevolent intention which the Saviour had in regard to mankind generally, but on the nature of his death abstractly, as in itself of infinite value, and sufficient for the salvation of all. And does not this, therefore, represent it as something incidental and independent of design, rather than an effect of previous purpose and divine arrangement? Besides, we submit whether the unrestricted universality of the gospel call is not inconsistent with the theory, that Christ died 'only for the sins of those to whom, in the sovereign good pleasure of the Almighty, the effects of his death shall be finally applied?' How is it possible that sinners could have been placed at all under the mediatorial form of government, or commanded to believe on Christ that they might be saved, unless he had died for this end; and unless he had thereby removed those legal obstacles which the sin of Adam had interposed between the race, and such a manifestation of divine benevolence?

3. The *third* theory regarding the death of Christ is that 'of indefinite or universal atonement, with gracious

sovereignty in its effectual application.' This theory is adopted by Dr Wardlaw and many theologians of the new school. 'According to this scheme,' says he, 'the atonement was designed as a vindication, manifestation, or display of the righteousness of God, such as to render forgiveness and salvation consistent with the honour of that perfection of the divine character; leaving the supreme Ruler and Judge in the free and sovereign exercise of the mercy in which he delights, to dispense these blessings more or less extensively, "according to the good pleasure of his will."'—(Dr Wardlaw's Discourses on the Nature and Extent of the Atonement, p. 65.)

Waving the objection we have taken to the use of the word atonement in these quotations, as if it were of the same meaning as the sacrifice of Christ, we object to this theory for the following reasons:—

(1.) Because it goes to the opposite extreme of the second theory, and represents Christ as laying down his life equally for all men, and excludes any speciality of design in regard to those who were given him of the Father.

According to this theory, though the Lord Jesus Christ, in laying down his life, acted from design, yet his design had merely a common and equal relation to all men, and no special reference to those that are to be saved. We object to this theory, not only because, like the second, it is defective, and does not state the whole truth on the subject, but also because

it states what is false and unscriptural. In the preceding section, we have already seen that the Saviour died, not merely to remove those legal obstacles which the sin of Adam had interposed between men and salvation, and to place them under the mediatorial dispensation; but that he also died to secure the removal of unbelief, and every other moral obstacle, from the minds of all who are saved,—or, in other words, to secure the presence and agency of the Holy Spirit, not only to give all men an objective revelation of the truth which they are to believe, but also to operate subjectively on the mind of those who were given him of the Father. If, then, these things are so, must not the theory in regard to the death of Christ, which restricts it to the former of these objects, to the exclusion of the latter, which denies all speciality of saving design therein, in reference to his people, and which thus disconnects it from their actual salvation, be evidently false and unscriptural? We put it to the advocates of this theory, whether a view of the death of Christ, which is so *meagre and limited*, as only to render salvation available to sinners, without securing the salvation of any, is at all consistent with those lofty descriptions which are given of it in the Word of God? And whether we are to consider the ransomed of the Lord as in error, when they gratefully and joyously celebrate the praises of the Lamb, in singing the new song, 'Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof, for thou wast

slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood?' This theory must either be abandoned, or those passages of scripture which speak of the special love which Christ has to his people, and of the blessings of salvation as secured to them by his blood, as 'the blood of the everlasting covenant,' must be sophistically expounded. We leave the alternative to the choice of its advocates.

(2.) We object to this theory, because it represents the Mediator as acting only in the name of God, and for God and the human race generally, and not also in the name of his people, and for their salvation, and thus gives only a *one-sided* view of his official character and work.

The Lord Jesus Christ, as mediator between God and men, had a work to perform in relation to both of the parties between whom he mediated. He had a work to perform for God in reference to the human race, namely, to render it consistent with his character, as the righteous Governor of the universe, to command all men to believe on Christ that they might be saved, and to issue the promise, 'Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.' And he had also a work to perform in reference to those who were to be saved, namely, to secure their salvation. The former work he performed, as we have already seen, in the human nature, as the Father's servant, and the latter as a descendant of Abraham according to the flesh, and as the representative of those who are

called Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise. What he did for God, as his servant, rendered it consistent in the Almighty to establish the mediatorial economy amongst men, and to place salvation within their reach. What he did for his people, as their representative, rendered their salvation absolutely certain, according to the terms of the covenant, 'When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed.' Now, if these things are so, then the theory which represents the death of Christ as merely 'such a vindication, manifestation, or display of the righteousness of God, as to render forgiveness and salvation consistent with the honour of that perfection of the divine character,' must be one-sided and defective, since it obviously restricts that event to the former of these objects, to the exclusion of the latter. Such a view of the subject is altogether inconsistent with the character which Christ sustains in the economy of redemption, as the public head and federal representative of his body—the church; for how could he sustain any special relation to the seed whom the Father promised that he should see, on the condition of making his soul an offering for sin? or how could their sins be imputed to him? or how could he obey, and suffer in their name, and to secure their salvation, if his death was merely designed so to display the righteousness of God as to render forgiveness consistent with the honour of that perfection of the divine character?

Those who have adopted this one-sided and limited view of the death of Christ, defend it on the assumed principle that 'it is to *public justice* that, in substitution and propitiation, the satisfaction is made.'—(Dr Wardlaw's Discourses on the Atonement, p. 59.) 'Considering justice,' says Dr Wardlaw, 'according to the ordinary definition of it, as the attribute that *gives every one his due*, I have now to remark that it has been divided into various kinds. They have been designated—vindictive, commutative, distributive, and public.'—(Dr Wardlaw's Discourses on the Atonement, p. 52.) After setting aside the first three kinds of justice, as those to which satisfaction was not given by the death of Christ, he concludes 'that it is to *public* justice the satisfaction was made.' Now, with all due deference to so good a man, and so eminent a theologian as Dr Wardlaw, and to other divines who have introduced this old scholastic distinction regarding justice, in the discussion of this subject, we submit whether the distinction is a proper one, and whether it does not 'darken counsel by words without knowledge?' Justice, confessedly, is that perfection of the divine nature, in the exercise of which the Almighty demands from all rational beings the things which are due from them to himself, as their Creator and Lord, and gives to all the things which are due to them, according to the terms of that law by which he governs them. But where are the proofs, either from scripture or reason, that there are 'various kinds' of

justice? Is justice, in all the kinds which have been specified, anything else than one simple principle, under different forms of manifestation? Is vindictive, or vindicatory justice, as some have called it, anything else than justice manifested in the punishment of the transgressors of law, and of which Christ shall give an awful revelation, 'when he shall come in flaming fire, *taking vengeance* on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ?' It is not revenge. Is commutative justice anything else than justice manifested in returning to a man his own, or an equivalent, according to mutual agreement, for that which has been purchased from him? Is retributive justice anything else than justice manifested in the bestowment of rewards, or in the infliction of punishment on moral agents, according to their works? Is public justice anything else than government administered according to the laws of equity? If, then, justice is one simple principle, and if there are not different kinds of it, must it not be absurd to speak of the death of Christ as a satisfaction given to public justice, in contradistinction to other supposititious kinds of it? Besides, according to such an hypothesis, would not the satisfaction be given to an accident of justice,—its publicity, rather than to justice itself?

Assuming it, however, to be conceded by our opponents, that the death of Christ is a true and proper satisfaction, not to the publicity of justice, but to

the justice of God itself, we ask them how his obedience unto death could be a satisfaction to the justice of God, if he had not maintained the authority of his law in its awful majesty, and upheld the penal sanction annexed to it in its inviolable truth, by giving perfect obedience to its precepts, and by submitting to death as the penalty of its transgression, in the name, and as the representative of those to whom his righteousness was to be imputed, as the ground of their obtaining deliverance from condemnation, and the justification of life? Would it not have been a manifest act of injustice on the part of the Father, either to have demanded from Christ obedience to the precepts of the law, or to have inflicted death on him as a penal evil, if these things had not been due in equity to God from him? But how, we further ask them, could obedience and death be due, in equity to God, from Christ Jesus our Lord? He confessedly could not owe obedience to God for himself; for as a divine person he was the equal of the Father, and not under law to him. Nor could he be liable to suffering and death for himself; for 'he was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners,' and therefore not worthy of death. He could only owe obedience unto death to the Father, on the principle that he voluntarily and graciously consented to become the surety of the covenant, and the representative of his people. Apart from his own voluntary act in placing himself under the law, or in assuming their legal responsibilities, the

Father could not, in equity, have commanded him to lay down his life, either for the establishment of the mediatorial dispensation in the world, or for the salvation of his chosen people.

The death of Christ, viewed in its relations to God and the human race, and in so far as it removed those legal obstacles which the sin of Adam had interposed between man and the favour of the Almighty, can only be accounted for on the principle that he died in the human nature, as the Father's servant, for the attainment of this end of the purpose of mercy; but his death, when viewed in its relation to the many sons who shall be brought to glory, and in so far as it secured the removal of those moral obstacles which existed in themselves, and which unfitted them for heaven, can only be accounted for, as it appears to us, on the additional principles that he covenanted to save them, and that he did actually, as their federal head and representative, 'bear their sins in his own body on the tree, that they, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness, and, being as sheep going astray, might return unto him, the Shepherd and Bishop of their souls.'

Besides, if the representative character of Christ were denied, on what principle could his righteousness be imputed to those who believe on his name, and the justice of God be manifested in their justification unto life? 'God hath set forth Christ Jesus,' says the apostle Paul, 'to be a propitiation

through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins, . . . that he might be just and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus.' Is it not evident, from this passage, that the righteousness of God is manifested, not in the justification of all those who are placed under the mediatorial dispensation, but in the justification only of the man 'who believeth in Jesus?' But how could the sinner who believes in Jesus be justified on the ground of his all-perfect righteousness, unless that righteousness were imputed to him? and how could it be imputed to him unless Christ had wrought it out in his name and as his representative; for no act, as we have already seen, can be righteously imputed to any moral agent, except that which is either done by his own personal agency or by the agency of his representative? 'Look at the case,' says Dr Junkin, 'with the unclouded eye of calm reason. The Son of God does suffer. But, says the system we combat, he is not guilty—he has no sin of his own—no sin of others is imputed to him which can be the just moral cause of his death—he dies, not to satisfy the law for his people's sins, but only to exhibit God's hatred against sin in general, and to give assurance to the moral universe that God is just whilst he forgives sin, and so to quiet the fears of holy angels and men, and rivet the convictions of unholy angels and men, that God is just.

'Now, I ask you, can you conceive of a more dreadful act of injustice than is presented in the sufferings

of Christ, on the supposition that his people's sin is not imputed to him? If you cannot, I ask again, how can this give security to the moral universe? Must it not do exactly the contrary? May not Gabriel say, If Jesus thus suffered, having no sin to account for, of his own or any other's, may not I, also, and all this shining host, be brought to endure such degradation and anguish? Where is our security? Whose head so high as not to be thus bowed down? Whose crown so safe as not to be thus cast to the dust?

'Return we then, dear reader, to the simple and glorious doctrine of salvation, by and through the vicarious obedience and death of our divine Surety. He bore our sins in his own body on the tree. Thus God's justice is satisfied, and calls for our deliverance from death, and restoration to eternal joys. Here is nothing indefinite, nothing uncertain, nothing conditional; here is "an everlasting covenant with you, even the *sure mercies* of David."'—(Dr Junkin on Justification, pp. 240, 241.)

On the whole, we object to the theory which represents the death of Christ merely 'as a vindication, manifestation, or display of the righteousness of God, such as to render forgiveness and salvation consistent with the honour of that perfection of the divine character,' because it is a defective and one-sided theory, and does not contain the whole truth of the case. It merely states the design of his death in reference to mankind generally, and the principle on

which all men are placed under the mediatorial dispensation; but it keeps entirely out of view the ultimate and most important end for which he died—the manifestation of the glory of God in the salvation of his chosen people, and either ignores or denies the representative character which he sustained, and in which he acted for the attainment of this end.

(3.) We object to this theory, because it dissevers salvation from the death of Christ. If the death of Christ 'was *designed* as a vindication, manifestation, or display of the righteousness of God, such as to render forgiveness and salvation consistent with the honour of that perfection of the divine character,' then it follows, that to render the salvation of sinners consistent with the righteousness of God, is the only end in reference to man that has been accomplished by the death of Christ; for it could manifestly effect no other end than that which God designed or purposed to accomplish by its instrumentality. The death of Christ, therefore, according to this theory, has no special and saving relation to any of the children of men. It has merely rendered the salvation of all men possible, but the salvation of none certain. It has merely removed those legal obstacles which rendered it consistent with righteousness in God to proclaim pardon to the guilty, and to save them from merited punishment; but it has not secured the removal of those moral ob stacles which exist in the sinner himself, and which

render the salvation of some absolutely certain. 'Sinners themselves,' says Dr Wardlaw, 'are not changed by the making of the atonement. The tidings of its having been made finds them in their sins, their guilt, their condemnation, their enmity: and the relation it bears to the obstacles which exist in themselves, is that of a MOTIVE or INDUCEMENT TO THEIR RENUNCIATION.'—(Dr Wardlaw on the Atonement, p. 128; the capitals are Dr Wardlaw's.) Such, according to this scheme of doctrine, is the connection that exists between the death of Christ and the salvation of men. His death 'does not remove those obstacles which have their place in sinners themselves,' but is simply a motive or inducement to their renunciation. Now, we ask Dr Wardlaw, has the Saviour, by means of his sacrificial death, done no more than this for those who are saved? Has he thereby merely furnished all men with a motive to lay aside the enmity that is in their heart against God, and to abandon their unbelief in the gospel of his grace?

In determining this point, the question is not, as the reader will observe, Is the death of Christ, in its cause, its nature, its designs, and in its results, a motive to induce sinners to lay aside the enmity of their hearts against God, and gratefully to accept the blessings of his love for their salvation? On this subject we have no dispute with him. Nor is the question, Were those obstacles which exist in sinners themselves actually removed by Christ's death at the

time when it took place? These obviously could not be removed until they existed; and they could not exist anterior to the birth and agency of sinners themselves. Nor is the question, Is it the work of the Holy Ghost to remove these moral obstacles, and thus actually to bring sinners into a state of salvation by means of his regenerating influences? On this point also we are at one with him. But the question is, Did the Saviour die *to secure* the presence and agency of the Holy Spirit to remove those moral obstacles which exist in the mind of the sinner himself? Yea or not? If Christ did not die to secure the agency of the Spirit to regenerate the heart of those who are saved, but merely to furnish all men with a motive or inducement to renounce the enmity that is in their heart towards God; then it is evident that there is no real connection between the death of Christ and the salvation of sinners; for the relation of a motive or inducement to believe on Christ secures nothing, unless provision were also made for the subjective operation of the Spirit on the mind to influence the will to yield to it. And it is further evident that there is no ground of certainty for the actual salvation of any sinner; for, according to this hypothesis, the regeneration or non-regeneration of the sinner is made to depend not on the operation of the Spirit upon the heart, but on the contingency of human volition in yielding unto or in resisting the external motives of the gospel. According to this

theory, therefore, Christ would have died in vain, and might never have seen of the travail of his soul, and been satisfied.

If, however, the Saviour died to secure the presence and agency of the Spirit to regenerate the heart of those who are saved; then it is evident that the relation which his death bears to those moral obstacles which exist in themselves, is that of an effectual means to their removal, and therefore more than a motive or inducement to their renunciation. But we have formerly proved that Christ died that the Spirit might be sent to regenerate and sanctify those that are saved, or to remove those moral obstacles which existed in their hearts, and which unfitted them for entering into the kingdom of heaven; and if so, then it clearly follows that the regeneration of the soul is one of the effects of Christ's death, and consequently, that the theory which dissevers salvation from that event is unscriptural, and ought to be rejected. Oh! does not this theory, to a great extent, make the cross of Christ of none effect? Does it not despoil it of its chief riches and glory? And does it not tend to undermine the very foundation of the believer's hopes of a blessed immortality?

(4.) Finally, we object to this theory, because it restricts divine sovereignty to the effectual application of redemption. Sovereignty is that perfection of the divine nature, in the exercise of which the Almighty

bestows benefits on the undeserving, to which they have no claim in equity, and that according to the good pleasure of his will. Now, the theory 'of indefinite or universal atonement, with gracious sovereignty in its effectual application,' plainly restricts the sovereignty of God to the application of redemption. This indeed our opponents do not deny: 'The place for election,' says Dr Wardlaw, 'lies in the application of the remedy.'—(Dr Wardlaw's Essays on Assurance and Universal Pardon, p. 291.) The application of redemption is the work of the Holy Ghost; for he is that person of the Godhead who actually brings sinners into a state of grace by the washing of regeneration. According to this theory, therefore, divine sovereignty is excluded from those works which the Father and the Son perform in the economy of redemption, and is restricted to the agency and work of the Holy Spirit. But does not the purpose of mercy confessedly originate in the sovereignty of the divine nature; and is it not, as we have formerly shown, equally the purpose of the Three Persons of the Godhead? And if so, must not sovereignty characterise all those acts which the Father and Son perform in the execution of it, as truly as those which are performed by the Spirit of God? Must not all the persons of the Godhead co-operate in the works which they severally perform, for the accomplishment of the highest and chief end of that purpose—that God may be glorified in the salvation of his

chosen people? And must not the design of the Father in sending the Son into the world—the design of Christ in dying—and the design of the Spirit in the application of redemption, have a common relation to this end, and be equally consummated in its accomplishment? If there is sovereignty and speciality in the application of redemption, must there not, on these principles, be also sovereignty and speciality in the love wherewith the Father loved his people from eternity, and in the love wherewith Christ loved the church when he purchased it with his own blood? And if so, must not the theory regarding the extent of Christ's death, which thus restricts divine sovereignty to the effectual application of redemption, be rejected as defective and unscriptural? We are, no doubt, taught in the scriptures that the elect are *chosen* to salvation *in the Spirit*, or through his regenerating and sanctifying influences; for they are declared to be elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, *through sanctification of the Spirit*. (1 Pet. i. 2.) But we are as distinctly taught that they are *chosen in Christ*: 'We are blessed by the Father with all spiritual blessings in Christ; according as he hath *chosen us in him* before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children *by Jesus Christ*, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the Beloved: *in whom*

we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace.' (Eph. i. 3–7.) Dr Wardlaw, after quoting this passage, justly observes, 'Here the choice and the predestination to the adoption of children and its privileges are *in Christ*, as well as the subsequent actual acceptance, redemption, and forgiveness.'—(Dr Wardlaw on the Atonement, p. 78.) Now, if *the choice* and *the predestination* to the adoption of children and its privileges are, as he acknowleges, *in Christ*, ought not he and all who entertain this belief to abandon the theory that 'the place for election lies in the application of the remedy?' Are not these two statements contradictory propositions?

Further, according to this theory, are not the persons who receive the sovereign and efficacious influences of the Spirit an indefinite number, which may be increased or diminished according to the divine pleasure. 'The atonement leaves the supreme Ruler and Judge,' says Dr Wardlaw, 'in the free and sovereign exercise of the mercy in which he delights, to dispense these blessings more or less extensively, (that is, as we understand it, to a greater or lesser number,) according to the good pleasure of his will.' 'The atonement,' says he elsewhere, 'left the Divine Being at perfect liberty to pardon whom he would.' Now, is not the theory, as thus explained, inconsistent with the doctrine of eternal election? If God, in consequence of the death of Christ, is left at perfect liberty

to pardon a greater or lesser number of the children of men, then, evidently, a definite number of our race were not predestinated to salvation prior to that event, for, according to the hypothesis, this number may be either increased or diminished, under the administration of the Spirit. But the apostle Paul tells us that those who are saved were chosen in Christ *before the foundation of the world*, and also, that they were chosen in the Spirit from eternity: 'God,' says he, regarding the saints at Thessalonica, 'hath *from the beginning* chosen you to salvation; through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth.' And if so, it follows that the number of those who shall be saved was known and determined by God from eternity, and therefore that it cannot be, as the theory supposes, an indefinite number. Besides, if salvation is the work of God, and if he actually saves, according to his promise, every sinner who comes to Christ, and who calls on his name for salvation; then, on the principle that he does nothing in time but what in eternity he purposed to do, it also follows that the number of those who shall be saved is not a matter of contingency, but determined by the predestinating sovereignty of divine love. If, then, those statements on which we have animadverted are inconsistent with the doctrine of eternal election, as revealed in the Word of God, are we not warranted to condemn them, and also to reject the theory, in regard to the death of Christ, which they are designed to explain and vindicate?

4. Having stated the three preceding theories, regarding the extent of Christ's death, and our reasons for rejecting them, we shall conclude this section by stating what appears to us to be the scriptural theory on the subject. With all due deference, then, we submit to the reader, that the true theory in regard to the nature and extent of the death of Christ, is—that OF ITS ABSOLUTE PERFECTION AND INFINITE VALUE WITH A TWOFOLD INTENTION—THE *first*, GENERAL, AND EMBRACING THE WHOLE HUMAN RACE—THE *second*, SPECIAL, AND EMBRACING THOSE ONLY WHO SHALL BE FINALLY SAVED.

If, as we have seen in the preceding discussion, the ends of the purpose of mercy, in relation to the human race, were in general twofold, *first*, To establish the mediatorial form of moral government amongst mankind, and to promulgate the law of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, as the rule by which the conduct of all men ought to be regulated; and, *secondly*, To save a certain and definite number of the race from sin and misery, and to bring them eventually to glory by Christ Jesus—if the Saviour died with the intention of accomplishing these two ends of that purpose—if HE died as the Father's servant, in the human nature, to remove those legal obstacles which the sin of Adam had interposed between man and salvation, and to render it consistent with the holiness of God, and with the principles of his moral government, to command all men to believe on him, as the Lord our righteous-

ness and strength, and to promise salvation to every sinner who should come to God by him—if HE further died as the representative of those who would come to God by him, so that his righteousness might be imputed to them, and their salvation rendered certain—and if, as we have also seen, both this general and also this special end of his death are distinctly stated in many passages of scripture: are we not constrained to reject every theory, regarding the extent of Christ's death, which ignores or denies either of these ends, and shut up to the conclusion that the theory we have now stated, which includes both a general and a special end, is the only consistent and scriptural theory on the subject?

According to this theory, the Saviour died, in a certain sense, for all men, and for all men alike—even in so far as to place them in common, as still rational and accountable, though fallen and sinful beings, under the mediatorial form of government, and to render their salvation possible and consistent with the righteous character and laws of God. And he farther died, in a special sense, for a definite number of the race—for the seed promised to him in the covenant as his joy and reward—to render their salvation absolutely certain. He died not with the intention to save all men, but to open a new and living way to the throne of grace for all. And he farther died with the intention to save all who would avail themselves of this privilege, and 'come unto the throne of grace,

that they might obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.'

If we admit that Jesus Christ died with the design of accomplishing both of these ends of the purpose of mercy, we can consistently and satisfactorily explain those passages of scripture which speak of his work in reference to Jews and Gentiles,—to the world,—to the whole world,—and to all men; and also those which speak of it in reference to God's elect. And further, we can also satisfactorily explain those passages of scripture which speak of the work of the Holy Ghost, in giving unto sinners indiscriminately, in the word and ordinances of God, an objective revelation of Christ, and of the way of salvation through faith in his name; and also those which speak of his work, in operating subjectively on the heart, so as to render the ordained means of grace efficacious for the regeneration of all who conscientiously observe them. But if we deny that he died for the accomplishment of both of these ends, and restrict his design in dying either to the one or other of them, then we are constrained to put a construction on many passages of scripture which is forced and unnatural, and which a correct exegesis does not justify.

VII. *The necessity of the death of Christ.*

When we speak of the necessity of the death of Christ for the establishment of the mediatorial dispensation among men, and for the salvation of sin-

ners, we do not mean that this event was absolutely necessary under the government of God. The Almighty, for aught that appears, might have dealt with sinful men merely according to the principles of equity, and left them to reap the bitter fruits of their transgressions, as he has done in regard to the fallen angels. But we mean that there was a *moral* necessity for his obedience unto death, on the assumption that God, in the sovereignty of his love, had purposed to establish such a dispensation of mercy with the human race, and to save his people from their sins. By moral necessity we mean such a necessity as arises from the holiness and justice of God, and from the nature of those laws by which he rules over the intelligent universe. In proof of the moral necessity of the death of Christ for the accomplishment of the ends of the purpose of mercy, we submit to the reader the four following arguments :—

1. The necessity of the death of Christ, both to the universal proclamation of mercy, and to the bestowal of pardon on those who believe, may be proved from the total inability, either of men or of angels, to fulfil the condition of the covenant of grace, or to work out a righteousness for the justification of life.

Righteousness, either personal or through the agency of a representative, is the only ground, so far as we can perceive, on which moral agents, whether in a state of probation or in a state of condemnation, can be justified under the government of God. As

righteousness, or perfect obedience to the law of works, was the condition on which the Almighty promised eternal life to Adam and his race under the Edenic dispensation; so, under the mediatorial dispensation, righteousness, or perfect obedience to the law of God, continues to be the condition on which men, as sinners and in a state of condemnation, are to obtain the justification of life. The law, however, as given to Adam in Paradise, required him only to give perfect obedience to its precepts; but as now addressed to sinful men, besides requiring them to obey its precepts, it further requires them to bear its curse. The two constituent elements, therefore, of that righteousness which the law demands as the condition of justification to life, are perfect obedience to its precepts, and the suffering of death, the penalty of its transgression. But men, as sinful beings and under the sentence of condemnation, are both physically and morally unable to work out a righteousness in regard to either of these two elements in which it consists. We are, *first*, utterly unable to give perfect obedience to the precepts of the law. It is written, 'There is none that doeth good; no, not one.' And where is the man who would desire his eternal welfare to be suspended on his personal conformity to the law of God in thought, in affection, and in action, throughout life—nay, even during a single hour? We are, *secondly*, equally unable to suffer death, the penalty of the law, so as to deliver ourselves from the wrath

to come. 'The redemption of the soul is precious, and it ceaseth for ever' for aught that man can do. Now, if we are unable to fulfil the condition of the covenant of grace, and to work out a righteousness as the ground of our justification before God; it plainly follows, that we cannot be saved on account of our own obedience. Hence says an apostle, 'By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin.' And it also follows, that if sinners of our race were to be saved, it could only be through the interposition of a mediator, who would graciously do that for them which they were unable to do for themselves. Hence we find that this is actually the case; 'for,' says Paul, 'when we were yet *without strength*, in due time Christ died for the ungodly.' (Rom. v. 6.)

Neither could angels, nor any other created beings, however high in the scale of intelligence and holiness, work out a righteousness for the justification of sinful men. They, indeed, as holy beings, could keep God's commandments perfectly; but as their obedience to its utmost extent is necessarily due to him on their own account, it cannot be transferable to others. Besides, if life is required for life, according to the principle of christian substitution, no angel could give his life for our redemption, as the case demanded. The life of an angel is not his own; it is the gift of God, and he can have no right to dispose of it as he pleases, but is bound to spend all

its powers in the service and worship of Him in whom he lives, and moves, and has his being. For these reasons, therefore, angels could do nothing whatsoever to provide sinners of our race with a righteousness as the ground of their justification before God. Now, if angels are totally unable to work out a righteousness for our justification in God's sight, then it evidently follows that no sinner could be justified on the ground of angelic obedience. And it also follows, that if any of our race were to be saved, it must be through the interposition of one who is Lord of his own life, and not by creation under a law of obedience to God for himself. Hence we find that the Redeemer of Israel is not a mere man, but Immanuel, God with us, and therefore Lord of his own life, and at liberty to dispose of it according to the good pleasure of his will. 'No man,' says he, 'taketh my life from me: but I lay it down of myself: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father.'

2. The necessity of the death of Christ, both to the universal proclamation of mercy, and to the bestowal of pardon on those who believe, may be proved from the reality of that death as the ordained means of human salvation.

It is a great and glorious fact, 'that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures.' But the Almighty does nothing in vain, and invariably employs the fittest means for accomplishing the purposes of his

will. If, then, Christ laid down his life that the mediatorial dispensation might be established among sinful and perishing men, and that his people might be saved from their sins, are we not warranted to conclude, from this great and undeniable fact, that his death was absolutely necessary for the attainment of these ends of the purpose of mercy; and that neither the works of sinners themselves, nor the services of the highest order of created intelligences, could have satisfied the claims of the divine law, and furnished men with a righteousness, on the ground of which they might have obtained the justification of life? If a lesser means than the death of Immanuel had been sufficient to effect these objects, is it at all credible that the God of infinite wisdom, with whom means and ends are ever strictly commensurate, would have employed the greater, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins? 'If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law: but the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.'

3. The necessity of the death of Christ to the salvation of sinners may be proved from the very nature of moral government. The government which God exercises over men, like that which he exercises over the intelligent creation, is of a moral character, and

suited to the nature of man, as a being endowed with reason, with power of volition and freedom of choice. It is neither a government of mere physical power, like that which he exercises over matter, nor of instinctive tendencies, like that which he exercises over irrational animals; but a government of laws and motives—of laws as rules of conduct, and of rewards and punishments as incitements to obedience. The government which the Almighty exercised over man in Paradise was of this moral character. God commanded Adam to give perfect obedience to his revealed will, and threatened death as the penalty of disobedience. The mediatorial government, which God exercises over man in his fallen condition, is likewise of a moral nature. God reveals himself to the world as the God of salvation, and commands every man, saying, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved;' 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength; and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself;' and threatens death as the punishment of unbelief and of disobedience. 'The soul,' says he, 'that sinneth, it shall die; He that believeth not shall be condemned; Cursed is every one that continueth not in all the things which are written in the book of the law, to do them.'

It is necessary to the very existence of moral government, that penal sanctions should be annexed to the law as a motive to obedience. 'Unless this were the

case, what has been called the authority of the law, or its efficiency as an instrument of moral government, its power to regulate the conduct of men could not be sustained. It is, in fact, the sanctions of the divine law, as is the case with every other law, in connection with its promises, which impart to it all the influence which it possesses. A mere statement of certain actions to be performed, and of others to be avoided, though it proceeded from the lips of one who had a right to assume the reins of government, unless there were presented along with it the prospect of some good to be obtained by obedience, and some evil to be endured as the result of disobedience, would be utterly devoid of efficiency. It could not, in fact, be an instrument of moral government; for moral government is the government of motives, and nothing can constitute a motive to action except the prospect of some good to be enjoyed, or some evil to be avoided, which is indeed the same thing.'—(Dr Payne's Lectures on Divine Sovereignty, pp. 168, 169.)

If, therefore, motives to obedience enter into the very nature of moral government, it is evident that such government could not exist if these were not maintained and perpetuated in their full force. But the power of motives, as an instrument of moral government, would obviously be destroyed if the penalty annexed to the law were to be dispensed with, and sinners allowed to escape with impunity. The Almighty, however, maintains the power of motives

and, consequently, the authority of his laws, by invariably inflicting, in the event of disobedience, the penalty annexed to them. Did he not maintain the power of motives, and, consequently, the authority of his law, by inflicting on the angels who sinned the punishment due to them on account of their transgressions? Did he not maintain the power of motives and the authority of his law by inflicting on Adam and his race the penalty of death, according to the terms of the Edenic constitution? Does he not maintain the power of motives and the authority of those physical laws which relate to the health and preservation of the life of man as a corporeal being, by inflicting disease and premature death on all who transgress them? And does he not maintain the power of motives and the authority of those moral laws which relate to man as a spiritual being, by threatening 'to take vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ'? Now, if God invariably sustains the authority of his laws by maintaining the power of motives in all its force, is it for a moment to be supposed that he sets aside or acts in opposition to this principle of his moral government in the scheme of human redemption, through the vicarious death of our Lord Jesus Christ? No. The supposition is impious. It is a doctrine of the Bible that Christ gave perfect obedience to the precepts of the law, and fulfilled all righteousness. And in the perfection of his obedi-

ence does not the law of God stand forth to the view of every rational being in all the immutable equity and authority of its demands? It is also a doctrine of the Bible that Christ suffered in its full extent and utmost severity the wrath of God due to us for sin—that he was made a curse for us. And in his death does not the authority of the law stand forth to the view of the intelligent universe in all the truth and integrity of its penalty as a motive to obedience? In the scheme of redemption, therefore, there is neither any relaxation of the law in reference to its precepts, nor any dispensation of it in reference to its penalty; but simply the gracious and voluntary substitution of the Just One in room of the unjust, that the law might be honoured and magnified, and sinners saved in conformity with those principles of moral government by which the Almighty rules over the intelligent universe.

Nay, the power of motives is not only not diminished, but unspeakably augmented by the work of God in saving sinners through the substitutionary death of the Lord Jesus Christ. The death of Christ is not the death of a mere man. It is not the death of the highest archangel; but the death of the Son of God in the nature of man. What a wonderful event! How awfully sublime! The Son of God dies! 'The Just One suffers for the unjust, that he might bring us to God!' Can rational intelligences, in contemplating this stupendous event,

fail to perceive that sin is so evil in its nature as not to be pardoned, and in its punishment so great and terrible as not to be averted, except through the sufferings of a divine Redeemer? And must they not feel that the motives to holiness are strengthened by the very means which the only-wise God employs to save the ungodly from their sins? 'There is forgiveness with thee, O Lord, that thou mayest be feared.'

On these principles, we conclude that the very nature of the moral government of God rendered the death of Christ necessary for the salvation of sinners. If the Almighty were to dispense with the penalty of his law, and neither to execute it on the sinner himself, nor on Christ as the representative of those who are saved — if he were to pardon sinners without obtaining satisfaction for their transgressions — would not this destroy the power of motives as a means of obedience, and subvert the principles on which his moral government is founded and administered, as a government of law and motives? Dispense with the penalty of the law, and would you not thereby destroy the power of motives? Destroy the power of motives, and would you not thereby annul the obligations of the law? And where, on such a hypothesis, would be the authority and moral government of Jehovah as Lord of all?

4. The necessity of the death of Christ to the

salvation of sinners, may be proved from the character and perfections of God,—the moral Governor of the universe.

The necessity of the death of Christ to the pardon and salvation of sinners might be shown not only from the nature of moral government, but also from all the perfections of the divine character—from the wisdom, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth of God: 'For it became him,' says an apostle, 'for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.' But, without going over this extensive field of argument, we shall merely turn the attention of the reader to the proof of its necessity which arises from the justice of God, or from those principles of equity on which his administration, as the moral Governor of man, is founded.

The law by which God governs the world is a righteous law. He requires nothing more from men than that love and obedience which they necessarily owe to him as their Creator and Lord. His law is summarily contained in the command, 'Be ye holy, for I am holy.' The law, according to these words, is evidently a transcript of the moral character of the Divine Being, and, therefore, it must be a just and right rule of conduct. Further, the threatening of death which the Almighty has annexed to his law, to teach men that he will not suffer it to be broken with impunity, and thereby to deter them from transgres-

sion, is a righteous threatening; for what is death, in all the evils which are comprehended in it, but the manifestation of the wrath of God against men on account of their sins? It is, undoubtedly, a righteous thing in God to be angry with those who violate the laws of his government. And if so, must it not also be a righteous thing in him to threaten death as the punishment of transgression? Now, if the law is just, and if the annexation of the threatening of death to it, as a motive to obedience, is also just and right, does not justice require the execution of the threatened penalty on those who have incurred it by transgression? If it is just and right in God to enforce obedience to his laws, by the threatening of punishment, must it not be equally just and right in him to inflict punishment on all who disobey him? Besides, how could the truth and faithfulness of God be vindicated, if he were, in the administration of law, to dispense with the penalty threatened, and to pardon sinners without obtaining satisfaction for their offences? The righteous Lord, evidently, would not give to sinners that which was due to them, according to the laws of his government, were he not to punish them according to their desert. But if God were to execute the penalty of the law on sinners themselves, none could be saved, all must inevitably perish: 'If thou, Lord, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand?' If, therefore, any of our race were to be saved, the penalty of the law must be executed, not on sinners themselves,

but on One who was able, and who would voluntarily engage to suffer it in their name, and as their representative; for how could the equity of the law be vindicated, and the moral government of God maintained in its efficiency, if its penalty were dispensed with, and sinners saved without satisfaction for their sins? Substitution seems to be the only principle on which the claims of the law could be maintained and mercy extended to transgressors. Hence we find that the substitution of the Just One in the room of the unjust, is the principle on which the mediatorial government of God is founded and administered.

The moral government of God admits the provision of a substitute. The fact that such provision has been made, is a sufficient proof of the truth of this statement. It should, however, be carefully observed, that the substitution of Christ in the room of the guilty is not inconsistent with the principles of righteousness, or in the least degree subversive of the claims of strict justice. The provision of a substitute is simply an act of sovereign grace, and does not, therefore, interfere with the claims of equity. It does not set aside the demands of the law. On the contrary, it is an act designed to secure their fulfilment, without one jot or tittle of abatement, and in consequence of which the law, both in reference to its precepts and its penalty, is magnified and made honourable. An act of divine sovereignty can never 'suspend, supersede, or overrule' the principles of equity on which the government of

God is established and administered. Justice and judgment continue to be the habitation of his throne, while mercy and truth go before his face. 'Jesus fulfilled all righteousness.'

Having thus shown the necessity of the death of Christ to the salvation of sinners, from the justice of God, and those principles of equity on which his moral government is founded and administered, we might now leave this part of the discussion; but before doing so, we beg, in further illustration of it, to state the theory which theologians of the new school have adopted on the subject, and to quote Dr Marshall's able refutation of it.

'*Distributive*, or as others designate it, *retributive* justice, according to its strict requirements,' says Dr Wardlaw, 'admits not of substitution. It issues a righteous law with a righteous sanction. It passes its sentence of condemnation against the transgressor of that law. It makes no mention of any possible satisfaction, but the punishment of the guilty themselves—the endurance by them of the penal sanction in their own persons. It is only by the death of the sinner himself that the proper demand of the law can be fulfilled, that the principles of distributive justice can have their due application, and that under this aspect of it, consequently, justice can be satisfied. According to the requisition of justice in its distributive sense, every man personally must have *his own due*. But in substitution it is otherwise. There is an inversion of the

principles of strict retribution. Neither Christ nor the sinner has his own due. The guilty who, according to these principles, should suffer, escapes, and the innocent who should escape, suffers. In no strict and proper sense, then, can distributive justice be *satisfied* by substitution, when its demands, instead of being adhered to and fulfilled, are, for a special purpose and by an act of Divine sovereignty, suspended, superseded, overruled.'—(Dr Wardlaw's Discourses on the Atonement, p. 58.)

'The first thing to be noticed,' says Dr Marshall, in exposing the fallacies contained in this passage, 'is the definition of *distributive*, or, as it is otherwise called, retributive justice, in which, if I mistake not, the fundamental error lies. Dr Wardlaw tells us that justice, in this sense, "admits not of substitution,"—that it makes no mention of any satisfaction but the punishment of the guilty themselves, the endurance by them of the penal sanction in their own persons.' Now this, I conceive, assumes what is not true; nay, what, if true, would involve consequences infinitely serious —so serious as to sweep away everything deserving the name of atonement out of the Christian system at once and for ever. Most true it is, indeed, that the law which justice "issues," and in which it is embodied, says nothing of substitution. Most true it makes no mention of any satisfaction except that of the transgressors themselves enduring their own punishment in their own persons. It is one thing, however, not

to *mention* and another thing not to *admit of*—it is one thing not to reveal a method of satisfaction and another and a very different thing to pronounce it inadmissible, upon the supposition that it is revealed. Now here, I conceive, is the error of the new theology, an error which seems to me at variance with the whole Bible. The grand doctrine of the Bible is, that justice does admit of substitution—nay, not only admits of it, but that a substitute is actually provided—provided, not with a view to set aside the law, but to maintain it—not to evade its demand, but to magnify it and make it honourable—not to fulfil it only conventionally or in the way of making a moral display, which is language much too vague for persons of ordinary understanding, or, I suspect, of any kind of understanding, to comprehend; but to fulfil it in the way of inflicting its penalty, inflicting it strictly and truly—as strictly, as truly as it can be inflicted, not upon the transgressor himself, but upon another in his room. This, I humbly conceive, is the great truth taught in the Bible—the truth which, more than any other, characterises christianity as a remedial system. Sin being committed, the justice of God, which renders to all their due, requires that punishment shall follow. The law of God, which is nothing but his justice embodied, requires the same thing. Death, therefore, the penalty of the law, must needs be endured—endured exactly as it is denounced—not in such a way as to "suspend," or to "supersede," or to "overrule," the sentence, as

Dr Wardlaw expresses himself; but in such a way as to carry it fairly and honestly into effect. This is what upright dealing demands—such upright dealing as cannot be wanting in the operations of the Most High; and this, as the sacred record abundantly testifies, has actually been done. Christ has "suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." (1 Pet. iii. 18.) He "has died for us" as one man might die for another. (Rom. v. 7, 8.) He has laid down his life as the "ransom" of our lives. (1 Tim. ii. 6.) He has "redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." (Gal. iii. 13.)

'Dr Wardlaw affirms that the substitution of Christ is not compatible with "strict retribution. Neither Christ nor the sinner," he says, "has his own due. The guilty who, according to these principles, should suffer, escapes, and the innocent who should escape, suffers." In this, however, there must be some oversight, to call it by no harder name. "According to these principles," indeed, the sinner who is guilty escapes, for to effect his escape is the design of the whole proceeding; but Christ, who suffers, does not suffer unjustly. How could he suffer unjustly, suffering as he does, at the hand of God? Amazing as it may seem, in direct contradiction to the assertion of Dr Wardlaw, Christ *has* his own due. Christ, "according to these principles," although "he knew no sin," was made sin for us; although he was the "Just One," he suffered for the unjust, that he might bring us to God. Al-

though he was God's "righteous servant," the Lord "laid on him the iniquity of us all, and he bore it in his own body on the tree." To speak in the language of theology, which seems in strict enough accordance with the language of the scriptures, our sins were *imputed* to Christ; he became legally responsible for them, . . . and, in suffering the punishment of them, he suffered, of course, what was his *due*, otherwise he must have suffered unrighteously—otherwise his suffering must have been an act of injustice—injustice infinitely too shocking to be ascribed to Him who is the Judge of all the earth; and instead of vindicating his government, as the new theologians speak—instead of proclaiming the glory of it to the intelligent universe, must, had such a thing been possible, which it was not, have uprooted the lowest foundations of that government, and stamped the ruins of it with infamy. Away with words so horrid! with thoughts so horrid! Yes; but away also with the statements from which such thoughts, embodied in such words, are a fair and unavoidable deduction!'—(Dr Marshall on the Catholic Doctrine of Redemption, pp. 51–55.)

On the whole, in this section we have endeavoured to show, in proof of the doctrine, that the purpose of mercy is accomplished by means of the work which Christ performed in fulfilling the condition of the covenant of grace—that the Son of God was fitted, by the constitution of his mediatorial character, for fulfilling the condition of that covenant—that, in ful-

filling the condition of the covenant of grace, he gave obedience to the precepts of the divine law, and suffered death, the penalty of its transgression—that his obedience unto death was absolutely perfect—that it was of infinite value—and that it was truly efficacious, and secured the accomplishment of all the ends of the purpose of mercy. And we have also shortly considered the questions concerning the extent of Christ's death, and its necessity to the salvation of sinners. We now observe, lastly, that

SECT. IV.—*The purpose of mercy is accomplished by means of the work which the Mediator performs in heaven, in the administration of the covenant of grace.*

The designs of God in the purpose of mercy, in regard to mankind, as we have already seen, were, *first*, to establish the mediatorial dispensation with the race generally; and, *secondly*, to bring many of their number to glory. Now, as both of these ends were secured by the work which the Saviour performed in his state of humiliation on earth, so they are actually accomplished by the work which he performs as a Priest, upon his throne, in his state of exaltation in heaven. It might here be shown that the Lord Jesus Christ, having made his soul an offering for sin, is now exalted to see of the travail of his soul and to be satisfied—that all power is given unto him, in heaven and in earth, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living, and rule over all men according to the

mediatorial form of government—and that the Father hath exalted him a Prince and a Saviour also, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins. It might further be shown that Christ, as the administrator of the covenant of grace, carries on his mediatorial work in his state of exaltation, by making intercession for the Holy Ghost, that he should be sent forth, according to the arrangements in the council of peace, to favour mankind generally with the ministry of reconciliation, and to render that ministry efficacious for the salvation of those who were given him of the Father. And it might also be shown that both the general and special ends of the purpose of mercy are accomplished by means of the agency of the third person of the Godhead — That the Holy Ghost, as proceeding from the Father and the Son, has *first* actually established the mediatorial dispensation among men, by giving them a revelation of the will of God for their salvation; by commanding all men to believe on Christ, that they may be saved; and by promising that whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.—And, *secondly*, that he actually saves those who conscientiously observe the outward means of grace, and seek, through their instrumentality, to be blessed in Christ, by pardoning their sins and regenerating their hearts in the present life; and by giving them glory in the world to come. As, however, these things are not included in the nature of the mediatorial dispensation, but belong to its

administration, we shall not here enter on the discussion of them, especially as we may afterward consider the Mediatorial Dispensation in reference to its administration, in another treatise.

CONCLUSION.

We have thus endeavoured, in the preceding pages, to give the reader a consecutive and scriptural view of the nature of the Mediatorial Dispensation. The subjects to which our attention has been directed are truly marvellous in their nature, and unspeakably interesting in their results, and deserve to be most solemnly and prayerfully considered by sinful and perishing men.

The work of the Son of God, in 'once suffering for sins, the just for the unjust,' in its antecedents and consequences, presents to the mind of man a higher and more interesting manifestation of the glory of God than that which is given either in the creation or government of the material universe. And if, as rational beings, we are bound to contemplate the heavens, which declare the glory of God, and the firmament, which teacheth knowledge concerning him, that we may perceive his ineffable greatness, and learn to fear him; are we not, as sinful beings, much more bound to contemplate the glory of the Lord as it shines in the face of Christ, that we may obtain a knowledge of his character and works as the God of mercy,

and be made wise unto salvation? Let us then with open face behold, as in a glass, the glory of the Lord, that we may be changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.

The gracious design of the Son of God, in 'once suffering for sins, the just for the unjust,' was, '*that he might bring us to God.*' His work, as we have seen, is the fulfilment of all righteousness, and the only ground on which we, as sinners, can obtain the justification of life. 'Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.' If, then, the work of Immanuel is the means through which God manifests his glory in the salvation of lost man, is it not our duty and interest to make his work the chief subject of our attention and persevering study? The incarnation, the life, the death, the resurrection, the intercession, and the other mediatory works of Christ, are of more importance to us, as sinners, than all things besides. These events are the means of our everlasting salvation, and every thing temporal, when compared with them, dwindles into insignificance and very vanity. These events bring 'glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, and good-will toward men.' These events yield to time all its importance, and to eternity all its glory; 'apart from which man is a shadow, his very existence a riddle, and the stupendous scenes of nature which surround him are as incoherent and unmeaning as the leaves which the Sybil scattered

in the wind.' These events have occupied the mind and engaged the heart of the wise and good in times that are past. Into these things the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, searching what the Spirit of Christ, which was in them, did signify, when he testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. Nor shall these events be forgotten or disregarded in the ages that are yet to come. 'I will make,' says the Father to the Son, 'thy name to be remembered in all generations.' These events have attracted the attention of cherubim and seraphim, and are studied by them, that they may better understand the manifold wisdom of God. 'Which things the angels desire to look into.' Nay, these events form now the chief theme of thought and conversation among the spirits of just men made perfect. 'They talk of *His* decease which he accomplished at Jerusalem;' and when the children which the Father hath given to Christ shall be perfectly saved, and all brought to glory, these events shall ever form the burden of that song of salvation in which they will gratefully recount and celebrate the wonders of redeeming love. They shall praise the Lord, saying, 'Unto him that loved us, and hath washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father, to whom be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.'

Should we not, then, associate ourselves with the wise and good of all ages, with the angels of God,

and with the redeemed in glory, and study those things which the gospel reveals, until our perceptions of their nature and importance shall become thoroughly scriptural, and until our hearts shall yield themselves to their benign and sanctifying influences? These things are revealed not to gratify an idle curiosity, or to furnish matter of unprofitable speculation, but to show sinners the way of salvation, that through the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus, and the agency of the Spirit, they may be assimilated to God and meetened for heaven. Must it not, therefore, be the duty and interest of every man, as benevolently placed by the God of love under the mediatorial dispensation, to give such attention to its revelations and laws as that he may personally obtain the ends for which it has been established with the human race?

One of the grand designs of God, in establishing the mediatorial dispensation among men, as we have seen, was to make known to them the way of deliverance from a state of sin and misery, and of their restoration to his favour and image through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, and to furnish them with the outward means of obtaining these blessings. Must it not, then, be the duty of every sinner to whom the word of salvation is sent to seek eternal life through the knowledge of Christ, by the careful observance of those means of grace which God hath appointed for the attainment of this inestimable gift? Let all,

therefore, who, in the sovereign goodness of God, are favoured with the gospel, endeavour, like Zacharias and Elizabeth of old, 'to walk in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless;' and let them in humility and gratitude place themselves at the feet of Christ, that they may learn of him the lessons of truth and salvation, and thus find rest unto their souls. 'Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.' 'See then that ye walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise.'

The call of the gospel is addressed to every sinner, and all are equally bound to obey it. And, gospel hearer, if you hearken to Christ's voice, and come to him—if you confess your sins, and forsake them, God says 'you shall have mercy;' but if you refuse to obey, and set at nought all HIS counsel, and will none of his reproof, you must perish in your sins. It is not possible, in the nature of things, that any sinner can enjoy the blessings of salvation who contemptuously rejects them. And if you reject these, how terrible will be your punishment? 'Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.' 'If we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries. He that despised Moses' law died without mercy, under two or three witnesses. Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall

he be thought worthy who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite to the Spirit of grace? For we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord.' And again, 'The Lord shall judge his people. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God. Let unbelieving and unregenerated men consider these awful threatenings, and be persuaded, 'by the terror of the Lord,' to forsake their evil ways, 'and to return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon them, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.'

Another of the grand designs of God, in establishing the mediatorial dispensation among men, as we have also seen, was to save a definite number of our race from sin and misery, through the righteousness of Christ, and the regenerating influences of the Holy Spirit. Christ lived and died and reigns to save his people from their sins. The scriptures, however, plainly teach us, that the actual enjoyment of salvation stands connected—not merely with the riches of divine grace in providing a Saviour for sinners—not merely with the obedience of Christ in working out a righteousness for the justification of the ungodly—not merely with the agency of the Spirit in revealing the will of God for our salvation, and in giving efficacy to it—but also with our personal agency in observing the means of grace, in calling on the name of the

Lord, and in receiving him into our hearts by faith as the Lord our righteousness and strength. There is an ordained connection between the command to pray and the promise of salvation. 'Ask,' says Christ, 'and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you.' And there is consequently an ordained connection between the exercise of prayer and the enjoyment of salvation. 'For every one that asketh, receiveth; and he that seeketh, findeth; and to him that knocketh, it shall be opened.' 'For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.' There is also an ordained connection between the command to believe on Christ, and the promise of salvation. 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.' And there is, consequently, an ordained connection between the exercise of faith in his name, and the enjoyment of salvation. 'Verily, verily, I say unto you,' says Christ, 'he that believeth on me *hath* everlasting life.' Now, if these things are so, must it not be presumptuous in any sinner to expect that God will save him while he neglects the means of grace, and refuses to believe on Christ, and to apply to him by prayer and supplication for this unspeakable blessing? Let no hearer of the gospel, therefore, act so unreasonably, as to separate what God has joined together, and to expect pardon and eternal life while he neglects the ordinances of salvation, and refuses to come unto the throne of grace, that he may obtain mercy and find grace to help in

time of need. On the contrary, let all hearers of the gospel act like rational beings, and seek salvation in the way of divine appointment. Let them rest assured that Jesus is able and willing to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them; nay, that he will actually save all those who seek the Lord while he may be found, and who call on him while he is near. For is it not written, 'I said not unto the seed of Jacob, Seek ye me in vain; I the Lord speak righteousness, I declare things that are right?' And again, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you.' Do not these, and similar texts of scripture, warrant every sinner, who seeks salvation in the way of divine appointment, to entertain the confident assurance that his labours shall not be in vain; but that he shall actually obtain this invaluable blessing, according to the promise of the Strength of Israel, who will not lie nor repent? 'This is the confidence that we have in him, that if we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us; and if we know that he hear us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of him.'

If, therefore, reader, you will act wisely—if you will follow the counsels of that great Prophet whom the Lord your God hath raised up unto you of your brethren, and hear him in all things whatsoever he says unto you—if you are doers of his word, and not

hearers only, your hopes of a blessed immortality shall be gloriously realised, ye shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation, ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded world without end; and when the Judge shall appear on earth at the last day, ye shall have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his coming. 'Whosoever,' says Jesus, 'heareth these sayings of mine, *and doeth them*, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock.' But if you will not hear that Prophet, you 'shall be destroyed from among the people,' your hopes shall be frustrated, and you shall at last be covered with shame and everlasting contempt. 'Every one,' says Christ, 'that heareth these sayings of mine, *and doeth them not*, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it.' Reader, consider these sayings of Jesus, 'and the Lord give you understanding in all things.' 'And now may the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is well-pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.

APPENDIX.

THE EDENIC DISPENSATION.

(Page 1.)

This designation, which we have given to the law of works, and as a title to a treatise on the subject, has been objected to, by more than one reviewer, as geographically incorrect. The learned reviewer (E.) in the *United Presbyterian Magazine* says, 'We object to the title of Mr Meikle's book, *as a gross misnomer* —the Edenic Dispensation. Our belief is, that Adam was in Eden ere he was put into the garden, and he was still in Eden after the Lord God drove him out. It was not a garden named Eden, but a garden or enclosure in Eden.' Now, in opposition to E., our belief is, in common with theologians generally, that Paradise was a garden actually named Eden.

Paradise, in the scriptures, is explicitly called the garden *of Eden*. (Gen. ii. 15; iii. 23; Ezek. xxxvi. 35; Joel ii. 3.) The Hebrew word, Eden, signifies pleasure or delight; and it is evidently called the garden of Eden or of pleasure, not to describe *its locality*, but to describe *its nature*, as a delightful and pleasant place. It is also called 'the garden of the Lord;'—(Is. li. 3)—and if, as all will admit, it received this appellation because 'the Lord God planted it, and put the man into it,' are we not bound,

on the principle of consistency, when it is called the garden of Eden, to conclude, that it was so named because it was a delightful place—a place where God provided man with all means necessary for his happiness, yea, even with the means of perpetuating his own welfare and that of all his posterity on the most favourable terms? This view of the subject is confirmed by the *usus loquendi* of the sacred writers. The corresponding phrases, 'the trees of Eden' (Ezek. xxxi. 9, 16, 18), and 'the house of Eden' (Amos i. 5), figuratively describe, not the localities, but the properties of the objects to which they are severally applied. For these reasons, we think it evident that Eden was the name of the garden itself, and that neither the phrase, the garden of Eden, nor the garden of the Lord, is used to indicate the locality of Paradise, but to describe the nature of the place, and the agency by which it was prepared, as a suitable residence for man in a state of probation.

The truth of this conclusion is established beyond a doubt by the word of the Lord God to the king of Tyrus, when he says to him, 'Thou hast been in Eden, *the garden of God.*' (Ezek. xxviii. 13.) Is it not evident from this text, that Eden was the name of Paradise? The figurative application of Eden to the condition in which the king of Tyre had been placed, would manifestly be inconsistent with fact, if Eden had not been the name of the garden.

It must, however, be observed, that the Spirit of God, in two texts of scripture, speaks of Paradise as being *in Eden.* 'The Lord God,' it is said, 'planted a garden eastward in Eden.' (Gen. ii. 8.) And a river went out of Eden to water the garden. (Ver. 10.) It is evident from these texts that a district of country on the banks of the Euphrates was called Eden in the days of Moses. Now, the question is, whether was the name Eden given to that country

before the Lord planted the garden of Eden, and Paradise called the garden of Eden because it was an enclosure in Eden? or was Eden, as the name of the garden adopted in after times, to designate the country in which it was situated? If, as we have already proved, Eden was the name of the garden, it follows that the former opinion cannot be entertained, and that the latter is the correct and scriptural one. When Moses says, 'the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden,' he obviously points out to us the locality of Paradise. 'It is manifest,' says Scott *in loco*, 'that Moses intended to give an intelligible description of the situation of Eden to his countrymen.' And he tells them 'that this garden was situated *eastward* of Canaan, or of the wilderness where he wrote the history,' and that it was in the district of country now called Eden. In describing the locality of Paradise he uses names which could not have been given to the countries of which he speaks till after the deluge. The first river of Paradise, he tells us, is that which compasseth the whole land of Havilah, and the second river is that which compasseth the whole land of Ethiopia. (Heb. Cush.) But as Cush, from whom this land took its name, was the son of Ham, and as Havilah, from whom that land took its name, was the son of Cush, the son of Ham—(Gen. x. 6, 7)—it is evident that these names must have been given to the lands referred to after the flood, and that Moses, in pointing out the locality of Paradise, uses the names by which these countries were known in his own times. When, therefore, it is said that God planted a garden eastward in Eden, this description of the locality of Paradise, to be consistent with other parts of the same description, cannot be interpreted to mean any thing more than that it was situated in that district of country *now* called Eden. In support of this conclusion, we quote

the explanation which Robertson in his Thesaurus and Concordance of the Hebrew Scriptures gives of the text. He says, that the garden of Eden was a garden 'quem Deus plantaverat in ea regione quae *nunc* Eden vocatur.'

At what time this name was given to it is uncertain. It probably may have been called Eden in the days of Adam, for it is said that Cain went out from the presence of the Lord and dwelt in the land of Nod, on the east of Eden, or of the place where Paradise was situated. (Gen. iv. 16.) Important events in the history of man have often been recorded, and the memory of them preserved by the names that were given to those spots and districts of the earth in which they had taken place. The city, or country, or empire of Babylon received its name from the work of God in confounding the language of men, when they were impiously employed in building the city and tower of Babel. And shall any deem it improbable that the whole district of country in which the garden of Eden was situated, should be called Eden by Adam and his descendants, when they spake to one another of the important transactions of Paradise, after its boundaries had been obliterated, and its exact locality unknown or forgotten?

If, then, as we have already shown, Eden was the name of Paradise, and if it was the place where God established with Adam the covenant of works, may not that covenant be called with propriety the Edenic Dispensation? No single designation can give a full and perfect exhibition of that divine constitution. If we would indicate the time and place of its establishment, we can give it no other name than the Edenic or Paradisiac Dispensation. If we refer to the person with whom it was established, we must call it the Adamic Dispensation. And if we would express its nature, we must call it the Law or Cove-

nant of Works. I have called it the Edenic Dispensation, to indicate the time and place of its institution and administration; because no previous writer had given prominence to these important aspects of it, and chiefly because this designation appeared to me to mark with precision the time when Adam was constituted, and also when he ceased to be, and to act as, the representative of his race; which, as all will admit, are matters of very great importance, in every discussion on the covenant of works.

GLASGOW:
PRINTED BY S. AND T. DUNN,
14 PRINCE'S SQUARE.

Recently published, by the same Author,

THE EDENIC DISPENSATION,

WITH

STRICTURES ON CERTAIN OPINIONS OF THE LATE REV. GEORGE PAYNE, LL.D.,

AS STATED IN HIS LECTURES ON ORIGINAL SIN.

JOHNSTONE AND HUNTER, Edinburgh. Price 3s 6d.

'We very cordially recommend this able and most seasonable treatise, especially to the careful perusal of the ministers and students of our church. It is a work which would do credit to any divine in Europe. Lucid in its statements, logical in its reasonings, and in its general tenor sound and scriptural, it will prove, we trust, under the divine blessing, a powerful antidote to the errors which have been recently imported from the Continent and America, on a subject of fundamental importance.'—*Witness.*

'Much as we respected Mr Meikle's character and general attainments, we were not prepared for a volume displaying so much manly thought, careful analysis, and masterly exegesis, as this treatise. The fair, manly, and lucid handling which he gives to his theme throughout, shows that he scorns mystification and pretence, and that his only anxiety is not to maintain a hypothesis, or support a foregone conclusion, but to establish and elucidate a truth.'—*Scottish Press.*

'We cannot better characterise Mr Meikle's essay, than by saying that it is a closely-reasoned exposition of the scriptural doctrine of Original Sin. Entirely the product of the Author's study, far from being common-place, and not tedious. It deserves a place in the library of the theologian, will yield a

respectable contribution of original and independent matter, and merit preservation among the standard treatises on this important subject.'—*Christian Times.*

'In this volume the Author very ably combats a number of pernicious errors which prevail on the subject of Original Sin. The work is one of very great ability, the arguments are well reasoned, objections candidly met; and throughout the whole book there are manifest proofs of the reader being in the company of a liberal and enlightened divine.'—*Scottish Journal of General Literature.*

'Our author's theme occasionally leads him into some of the most difficult and perplexing paths of inquiry. At one time he is debating with Professor Stuart on the cause of the universality of sin in the world, and at another, attempting to refute the theory of Jonathan Edwards and the late eminent Dr Payne, which ascribes human depravity to a merely negative cause. And, then, again, we find him maintaining against Dr Payne, that the depravity of man is derived not from Adam in his paternal relation, but in his public and representative character. Without pretending to approve of every thing which our author has written on the subject, we do not hesitate to say, that his views are stated, for the most part, with clearness and precision, and that his strictures are characterised by moderation, respect, and good sense.'—*The Nonconformist.*

'It is redolent with the fragrance of the theology of the olden time, and cannot be perused without profit, by any one who will endeavour to master it. . . . The book has set us a thinking, and we venture to assure those of our readers who have a taste for speculations on the higher points of theology, that they cannot study this book without profit, whether they agree with the author or not.'—*Dumfries and Galloway Standard.*

'First, it is a compact treatise—topic follows topic in logical

sequence and connection. It is also a full treatise—full, if we take Mr Meikle's stand-point. No theme ordinarily connected with the Adamic covenant is overlooked, and each receives its fair proportion of space and argument. It is, moreover, though vulnerable in some points, an able treatise, luminous in conception, and accurate in expression.'—*United Presbyterian Magazine.*

'We do not know any recent publication which may be more safely recommended to members of Presbyterian churches in Scotland, who are desirous of seeing, in a compendious form, what is received among us about the covenant of works. . . . We would also recommend it to theological students at the commencement of their inquiries, as a convenient hand-book, both for indicating in what direction their search should be instituted, and on what principles it should be conducted. They will see in it an excellent specimen of what may be called the logic of theology.'—*Christian Journal.*

THE MILLENNIAL STATE OF THE CHURCH,

AND

THE AGENCY BY WHICH IT IS TO BE REALISED,

A SERMON,

Preached at the opening of the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church in Edinburgh, May 6th, 1850. Edinburgh: Johnstone & Hunter. Price 6d.

'We cordially thank the late Moderator for permitting us to renew in private the gratification with which we listened to the preaching of this able and fertile discourse.'—*United Presbyterian Magazine.*

DATE DUE

10/31/10		

GAYLORD #3523PI Printed in USA

BOUND BY
ADAM GOWANS
GLASGOW

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01006 4386